

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 4209. A bill to further amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide for the relief of certain widows, children, and other dependents of servicemen who die as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4210. A bill to provide for determination of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration with respect to persons discharged from the armed forces because of disability, prior to the granting of such discharge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. J. Res. 235. Joint resolution authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of Cook Inlet, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution to provide for a streamlined, simplified, and coordinated Federal tax system; to authorize and direct the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to make studies and recommendations in connection therewith; and to provide for the creation of a temporary advisory council to said committee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. Res. 442. Resolution to create a committee of the House to investigate the petroleum industry and problems of petroleum supply; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 4211. A bill for the relief of Ralph J. Herrick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 4212. A bill for the relief of Robert Rowe and Mary Rowe; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4213. A bill for the relief of Karl Lungstias; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4898. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of the Zetetic Club, of Indianola, Iowa, with 24 signers, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1161, the Murray-Wagner bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4899. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of the Maplewood Ladies Aid, of Malden, Mass., regarding the abrogation of the British White Paper and the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4900. Also, petition of various and sundry persons of Malden, Mass., with reference to the abrogation of the British White Paper and the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4901. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Arthur R. Marquardt and other residents of Onondaga County, N. Y., containing approximately 600 signatures, opposing prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4902. By Mr. HILL: House Joint Memorial No. 1 of the first extraordinary session of the Thirty-fourth General Assembly, State of Colorado, urging the United Nations to take steps to find even temporary havens of refuge for homeless and hounded Jews, and requesting that Palestine be opened wide to Jewish immigration and that Pal-

estine be reconstituted as a Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4903. Also, House Memorial No. 2, of the House of Representatives of the first extraordinary session of the Thirty-fourth General Assembly, State of Colorado, urging the Congress of the United States to take such steps as will provide for the commissioning in the Army of the United States of licensed chiropodists in order to serve persons serving in the Army with proper foot and leg treatment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4904. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 3 of the first extraordinary session of the Thirty-fourth General Assembly, State of Colorado, urging the Congress to assume the obligations of getting to the men and women in the armed services the absent voters' ballots prepared by the States, and to return said ballots to the proper State and local officials with all due dispatch, insuring secrecy in the ballot, and requesting that the Congress not attempt to assume the right to determine the qualifications of the voters and the form and contents and time and method of casting, counting, and canvassing the ballots; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4905. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition signed by 3,000 citizens of the Twenty-seventh District of New York, regarding consideration of prohibition at this session of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4906. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the Bronx County Medical Society, Bronx, New York City, opposing the medical and hospital sections of the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4907. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of Charles C. Hyre, Mrs. R. S. Hickman, Rev. Everett C. Zinn, Rev. B. S. Burhans, J. H. Funk, Nellie P. Bogges, and Mrs. A. B. Rohrbough, citizens of Clarksburg, W. Va., urging that Congress enact a law prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors during the duration of the war and the period of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4908. By Mr. ROLPH: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 15 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States regarding the matter of additional legislation to end the general uncertainty under which producers of agricultural commodities are now laboring; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4909. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 16 of the California Legislature, relative to the hospitalization of veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4910. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 14 of the California Legislature, memorializing the President, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Office of War Information, relative to the prompt release of war news; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4911. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 13 of the California Legislature, relating to termination of war contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4912. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 12 of the California Legislature, relating to the prevention of undue hardship on California industries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4913. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 9 of the California Legislature, relative to the enactment of legislation by Congress permitting the taxation of property belonging to the United States by the States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4914. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 5 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation to provide for the disposal by the United States Government of certain military vehicles and other equipments suitable for civilian use to United States veterans of the present conflict, to cities, and counties,

and to the State departments of education at the lowest possible price, and also to enact legislation for the financing of such purchases whenever necessary; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4915. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation providing a bill of rights for veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4916. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing Congress to simplify the income-tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4917. Also, House Resolution No. 51 of the California Legislature, relating to the ceiling price on hay; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4918. Also, House Resolution No. 57 of the California Legislature, memorializing Congress to enact legislation declaring illegal all waivers of compensation or adjusted compensation by men of the armed forces upon their discharge as a condition for honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4919. Also, House Resolution No. 48 of the California Legislature, relative to prolonging the wild fowl shooting season; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4920. Also, House Resolution No. 47 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing Congress for legislation concerning the delivery, distribution, casting, collection, and return of the absentee ballots; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4921. Also, House Resolution No. 31 of the California Legislature, relating to commending the railroads and their personnel for the exceptionally competent performance of services throughout the Nation in this present war emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4922. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 17 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing the President of the United States to exert his influence upon the Government of Great Britain to bring about the abrogation of the Chamberlain White Paper concerning Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4923. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of E. Wesley Woodruff and Isabel B. Sarver on behalf of the North Street Methodist Church, Wheeling, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4924. Also, petition of Stanley Owoc, president, Council 133, of the Polish National Alliance, having a membership of 2,500, comprising Brooke, Hancock, Marshall, and Ohio Counties, W. Va., urging the State Department to favor and foster the cause of a righteous adjustment of the integrity of the former pre-war boundaries of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the abundance of Thy mercy another day is added to the record of the lengthening years. For the morrow and its needs we do not pray. For the day which now bathes us in its

returning light, set Thou a seal upon our lips. Plant an understanding of our brother's need in our hearts. Vouchsafe to us some revelation of Thy truth upon our darkened minds. As patriots make us worthy of the past and equal to the present. We cannot adequately serve this troubled day without some guidance from Thy wisdom to lift us out of our bewilderment, some power from Thine infinite resource to strengthen us in our need.

May Thy servants who have been called to administer the affairs of this Nation make daily choice of spiritual integrity amid the corruption that is in the world through the lust of power, that, being unafraid, they may contend for the right as Thou dost give them to see the right. Lift upon us the light of Thy countenance as we come grateful for the best traditions of the Nation whose servants we are, anxious for it to play its destined role in this great day, prayerful for our embattled sons now scattered over all the earth, eager to clear the way for an ordered society of nations that shall give substance and hope to man's dream of brotherhood. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, February 16, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1243) authorizing the construction and operations of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil, shale, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3916) to permit the construction and use of certain pipe lines for pneumatic tube transmission in the District of Columbia.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 199. An act for the relief of Robert Norheim;

S. 255. An act for the relief of Josephine M. Meichlor;

S. 817. An act for the relief of George A. Rogers;

S. 921. An act for the relief of Mrs. Neola Cecile Tucker;

S. 933. An act for the relief of Lee S. Bradshaw;

S. 949. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum;

S. 1077. An act for the relief of William A. Haag;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Lucille Sleet;

S. 1288. An act for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens;

S. 1324. An act for the relief of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co.;

S. 1325. An act for the relief of Joseph Moret;

S. 1391. An act for the relief of W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan;

S. 1417. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage town site; and

S. 1494. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION FOR POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT RURAL DELIVERY SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 153)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the form of an amendment to the Budget for the Post Office Department, fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, increasing the amount for Rural Delivery Service from \$103,315,000 to \$107,690,000 (an increase of \$4,375,000), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SURVEY TO DETERMINE CAUSES OF CRITICAL LABOR SHORTAGE DESIGNATION OF HARTFORD (CONN.) PRODUCTION AREA

Mr. DANAHY (for himself and Mr. MALONEY), by unanimous consent, presented for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the court of common council and approved by the mayor of Hartford, Conn., which resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That—

Whereas Hartford has made outstanding contributions and efforts ever since the War of Independence to fight for and preserve our democracy, and has again in this present world conflict so richly earned the designation of the arsenal of democracy; and

Whereas the manufacture of airplane motors and propellers and Colt machine guns and cannon in the Hartford area, which together with kindred other products are a vital and integral part of the Nation's war efforts in this world conflict; and

Whereas the Hartford area in this State has been declared a critical labor-shortage area, whereby through the attendant loss of contracts Hartford can lose the opportunity to continue in these war efforts; and

Whereas continuance of such a designation of critical labor-shortage area can bring upon

the city of Hartford sudden extreme adverse economic circumstances: Therefore

We earnestly petition, That this board of aldermen respectfully request of the Federal Congress, through its Senators and Representatives, that the Federal Congress instruct the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, and such other Federal agencies involved to cooperate with representatives of the local communities involved, together with labor representatives and industrial representatives; all of whom will cooperate together in conducting a survey to determine the causes of the critical labor shortage designation and make such constructive recommendations as they deem advisable and further to publish a report of their findings and recommendations as soon as they are determined; and that copies of this petition are forwarded to each Connecticut Senator and Representative in Federal Congress and the President of the United States, and we respectfully urge that they act in unison to accomplish the purposes of this petition.

ABSORPTION OF RADIO INDUSTRY BY THE NEWSPAPER INDUSTRY

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for insertion at this point in the body of the RECORD and appropriate reference, a resolution that was "unanimously adopted by the New Haven Central Labor Council at its last regular meeting, opposing the absorbing of the radio industry by the newspaper industry"—and I am quoting from the resolution—"to prevent"—what is referred to as—"the continuance of this monopolistic trend."

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the present trend in the United States of the acquiring of radio broadcasting stations by large newspapers is a threat toward the control of public opinion and the stifling of controversial issues from an unbiased point of view;

Whereas control of radio stations by newspapers tends to restrict the information offered to the public to that which serves the interest of the newspapers;

Whereas absorption of these radio stations by amalgamation or combining with newspapers is a monopolistic tendency and not in accord with the democratic principles of the United States;

Whereas a distinct threat to democracy in the newspaper-radio combine is apparent when we realize that it is operated for profit and not in the public interest when a conflict between the two arises;

Whereas control of radio by newspapers puts the public in the position of getting only such news which is not influenced by their advertisers, or in any way adverse to their interests;

Whereas control of public opinion through radio and newspapers becomes a dangerous weapon for fascism as was the case in Germany when newspapers and radio stations were combined and used for Nazi propaganda;

Whereas whenever participation by many is replaced by control of a few powerful interests any further advance in radio is apt to be blocked since it may conflict with the profits of newspapers. This will be more and more apparent as television becomes a practical reality: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New Haven Central Labor Council goes on record as opposing the absorbing of the radio industry by the newspaper industry and that legislation be passed to prevent the continuance of this monopolistic trend. In the interests of democracy, a

free press, and a free radio, such combinations must be dissolved and prohibited in the future if we are to have unbiased, intelligent public opinion in this country which is in the last analysis the basis of all democracy; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the senatorial and congressional representatives from this district as well as a copy to Chairman Fly of the Federal Communications Commission.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1588. A bill for the relief of Charlie Holcomb; with amendments (Rept. No. 690); and H. R. 1273. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre; without amendment (Rept. No. 691).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2772. A bill for the relief of Edwin Foley; without amendment (Rept. No. 692);

H. R. 2875. A bill for the relief of Adelard Demers; without amendment (Rept. No. 693);

H. R. 3173. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 694);

H. R. 3195. A bill for the relief of Willard Kerr, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 695); and

H. R. 3371. A bill for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 696).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 248. A bill for the relief of Louis Courcil; with an amendment (Rept. No. 697); and

H. R. 2385. A bill for the relief of Nadine Gorman; without amendment (Rept. No. 698).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1355. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Harris; with amendments (Rept. No. 699);

S. 1665. A bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer; without amendment (Rept. No. 700);

H. R. 544. A bill for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay; with an amendment (Rept. No. 701); and

H. R. 2880. A bill for the relief of H. G. Tooley; without amendment (Rept. No. 702).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1313. A bill for the relief of Delores Lewis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 703); and

H. R. 2183. A bill for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister; without amendment (Rept. No. 704).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 929. A bill for the relief of Irving L. Jones; without amendment (Rept. No. 705); and

H. R. 1062. A bill for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart; without amendment (Rept. No. 706).

By Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1660. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Minnesota Department of Highways and the county of Crow Wing in Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street in Brainerd, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 707).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1006. A bill to authorize the condemnation of materials which are intended for use in process or renovated butter and which

are unfit for human consumption, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 708).

INVESTIGATION OF GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES IN THE OIL INDUSTRY—PETROLEUM RESERVES CORPORATION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce to report Senate Resolution 253, providing for an investigation with respect to petroleum resources in relation to the national welfare, with certain amendments thereto. The original resolution provided for a committee of nine to make a complete study and investigation of the petroleum problem, and to recommend a national policy. The resolution, as amended, provides for the appointment of two members from each of four committees, in order to cover jurisdictional questions in the Senate: First, the Committee on Foreign Relations, since the committee to be appointed will deal very much in the foreign field; second, the Committee on Interstate Commerce, which is concerned with transportation; third, the Committee on Commerce, which has had rather plenary jurisdiction of petroleum production; and fourth—and this is the new committee which is introduced because of the extensive studies it has made in the petroleum field in the past 2 years—the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

So, Mr. President, the resolution as now proposed to be amended and recommended by the committee provides for the appointment of two members from each of the four committees and a ninth member to be named by the President of the Senate.

I understand that the resolution, as amended, by the Commerce Committee, will be referred, under the rule, to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from Maine will be received, and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONTRACT TERMINATION OF MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Printing I report back Senate Resolution 241, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 241) submitted by Mr. MURRAY, on January 20, 1944, was read as follows:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Subcommittee on Contract Termination of the Committee on Military Affairs be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said subcommittee during the first session, on S. 1268, a bill to facilitate the termination of war contracts; S. 1280, a bill to provide authority to the Secretary of War

to use funds now or hereafter appropriated for adjustment of contracts, and for other purposes; and Senate Joint Resolution 80, a joint resolution to prohibit the use of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system of contracting in connection with war contracts.

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator asking for immediate consideration of the report?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator indicate what the resolution is?

Mr. HAYDEN. It authorizes the printing of hearings held before the subcommittee on contract termination of the Committee on Military Affairs. It is a very important subject.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSHFIELD and Mr. WILLIS each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MISSOURI RIVER PROGRAM—STATEMENT BY GOVERNORS OF MONTANA, NORTH DAKOTA, AND WYOMING

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement submitted today by the Governors of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives dealing with the development in connection with the Army engineers of an irrigation, reclamation, and power program on the Missouri River.

There being no objection, the statement was received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, we have listened to Colonel Reber discuss the plans of the Army engineers for the development of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries. The plan is too general to permit intelligent comment upon it in any great detail. We believe, however, if carried into effect it will accomplish its purpose, which is to protect the area below Sioux City from all future flood damage.

We note that to secure flood control below Sioux City the Army engineers were compelled to plan the construction of numerous storage reservoirs above Sioux City. These reservoirs have been referred to as multiple-purpose reservoirs. That is, they are to provide space to store floodwaters, which is later to be used for providing a wider and deeper navigation channel from Sioux City to St.

Louis, for irrigation and other purposes, all of which are commendable.

Back in 1902 Congress enacted the Federal Reclamation Act creating the Bureau of Reclamation and assigned to that agency the task of making the old homestead law operative throughout the 17 arid and semiarid States of the West by providing an artificial irrigation water supply so that 160 acres of land would support a family the same there as in the more humid States of the Nation. The purpose of the homestead law was to open land to production, settle, and stabilize the country and develop it. The Reclamation Act was designed to extend the benefits of the homestead law to the arid and semiarid half of the Nation.

In view of the above it was inevitable that these two agencies of the Federal Government would come into conflict over the use of the waters of the upper Missouri River. Here were two separate Federal agencies working under entirely different basic laws, responsible to separate committees of Congress, and serving conflicting purposes; one seeking to store floodwaters to prevent flood damage and to reserve the water for later use in aid of downstream navigation, the other seeking to store the same floodwaters higher up the streams and tributaries for later use upon the land for the production of crops and the closer settlement of farm homes. To a certain extent one might say that the basic concept by the people living along the more than 2,000-mile course of the Missouri River from its headwaters to its mouth, concerning what constitutes the highest use of its water, is just as divergent as are the views of these two Federal agencies. Because of these divergent views of the people the Army engineers wisely agreed to submit their plan for the use of the waters of this river to the Bureau of Reclamation for comments looking toward a reconciliation of views, or a correlation of plans for an over-all basin-wide multiple-purpose development program which would more nearly satisfy the needs of the entire area. The Army engineers' plan, with the comments of the Bureau of Reclamation, were then wisely taken under advisement by the Bureau of the Budget while en route to this Committee of Congress on Flood Control. The Bureau of the Budget was sufficiently impressed with the comments of the Bureau of Reclamation to request the Bureau of Reclamation to rush to completion their over-all plans for the upper basin of the Missouri River and its tributaries which have been under way for several years and for which some 50 or more independent reports had previously been completed. May 1 was the date set for these two completed reports to be in the hands of the Bureau of the Budget, the administration's only available coordinating agency today.

We who represent the upper basin States of Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota have believed that this was a fair and equitable procedure, that the two agencies guided by the administration's Budget Director as a sort of neutral referee, and with only a slight delay, could not help but come forward with a compromise that would be fair and equitable to all interests and to all sections of the basin and to the Nation.

Upon arriving in Washington we discover, however, that a third committee of Congress, established to serve another phase of the work of the Army engineers (the Rivers and Harbors Committee) has reported a bill and is seeking a rule to bring it to a vote on the floor of the House. This bill would lay claim to and establish by law such claim, as shown on page 199, paragraph 495, of House Document No. 238, 35,000 cubic second-feet of the 37,600 cubic second-feet which constitutes the total average flow for the last 14 years of the Missouri River at Kansas City, as shown by records of the United States Geological Survey (1929 to 1942, inclusive). We

accept this as a coincidence but request that an effort be made to amend that bill to protect the rights of our upper-basin States to an equitable portion of the stream's flow for domestic, irrigation, mining, and industrial purposes.

The Bureau of Reclamation has indicated that there is a minimum of 4,400,000 acres of additional land in the four upper-basin States that should be irrigated, enough to provide family-size farm homes for forty to fifty thousand additional farm families, America's greatest source of strength and self-reliance. This increase of irrigated farm lands would affect our respective States as follows: In Montana it would increase our present irrigation acreage by approximately 1,300,000 acres. In Wyoming, from the upper Missouri alone (the Yellowstone and tributaries) it would increase our present irrigated acreage from 547,000 to 1,147,000 acres. In North Dakota it would increase the irrigated acreage from 17,120 to 1,517,120 acres. Four million four hundred thousand acres of new irrigated land in the upper basin of the Missouri would more than add the production of a new State to that region, but most of all it would stabilize both our population and our production for all time to come and with the incidental power which such a program would develop, considerable industrialization of the area would follow, so that eventually the area could support double, or more, the present population.

We are not opposing the use of a reasonable amount of water for navigation below Sioux City but we are emphatic that the use in perpetuity of 32,000 or 35,000 cubic feet per second out of an average annual flow of 37,600 does not constitute either the most economic or the most beneficial use of such a valuable natural resource. If there could be inserted in the river and harbor bill or this committee should insert in your flood-control bill language which guarantees a certain fair and equitable portion of Missouri River water for upstream consumptive use (an amount which might be agreed upon) and provide further a program for ultimately installing locks and dams so that as upstream demands increased the lock and dam installation program could provide the same or better water navigation with less and less water, thus releasing more and more water for upstream uses, we believe that you would be pointing in the direction of a fair and equitable solution to the problem.

It is apparent to anyone that capital cannot be attracted to the construction of docks, tugs, or barges, or to irrigation works or farm improvements, until a fair, equitable, and permanent division of the use of the Missouri River water has been determined, and we doubt that any division which is not fair and equitable will be permanent.

We urge early conferences between the chairman of the Flood Control Committee, the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. We urge that further effort be made on the part of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to compose differences looking toward proper amendments to the river and harbor bill.

It is our present purpose to ask the proper committees of Congress to request the Bureau of Reclamation to make their basin-wide report available to the Congress at the same time that their report goes to the Bureau of the Budget, in order to expedite the consideration of the over-all Missouri River program by committees of Congress and the Missouri River States committee.

JOHN MOSES,
Governor of North Dakota.
SAM C. FORD,
Governor of Montana.
LESTER C. HUNT,
Governor of Wyoming.

REGIONAL ECONOMIES AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Regional Economies and the National Economy," delivered by the Vice President at Minneapolis, Minn., on February 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH OF MASSACHUSETTS TO LITHUANIAN MEETING AT WORCESTER, MASS.

[Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him to a Lithuanian meeting held in connection with the drive for the purchase of War bonds and the celebration of the twenty-sixth anniversary of the independence of Lithuania at Worcester, Mass., on February 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—ADDRESS BY JUDGE ROLAND J. STEINLE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of juvenile delinquency delivered by the Honorable Roland J. Steinle, judge, circuit court, Milwaukee County, Wis., at a meeting of the Child Welfare School Conference, Milwaukee, January 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUBSIDY SAVINGS—LETTER BY CHESTER BOWLES

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of subsidy savings written by Hon. Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, and published in the New York Times of February 16, 1944, and an editorial from the New York Times in reply to the letter, which appear in the Appendix.]

WIN THE WAR—POEM BY JAMES PATRICK MCGOVERN

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Win the War," composed by James Patrick McGovern, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TUNNELL BEFORE POLISH SOCIETIES AND CLUBS IN DELAWARE

[Mr. WALSH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator TUNNELL before the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in Delaware, at Wilmington, Del., on February 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

OIL FOR TOMORROW—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM PHILIP SIMMS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Oil for Tomorrow" written by William Philip Simms, which appears in the Appendix.]

STALIN MAKES THE PEACE TERMS—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stalin Makes the Peace Terms" from the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in the course of yesterday's debate the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] submitted a question regarding the functions of the United Relief and Rehabilitation Administration which bore upon a thoroughly fundamental and important point in connection with it. He asked the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. Gillette], who had the floor at the time, whether there had been any consideration given to using the American Red Cross as the instrumentality for this service. The Senator from Iowa replied:

No such proposal was made at any time when I was present at meetings of the committee.

I think that answer is textually correct; there was no such proposal made. On the other hand, I should not want the record to stand with any implication that that phase of the matter was not at least discussed in the committee. I read from the record of the hearings two or three questions and answers so that the record may be complete, because I think the point raised by the Senator from Tennessee is thoroughly pertinent. In the course of the examination of Assistant Secretary of State Acheson I asked him this question:

Is there any conflict between U. N. R. R. A. and the traditional historical service of the Red Cross?

Assistant Secretary Acheson replied:

Mr. Acheson. No; I should think clearly there was not. It is possible that there might be in some one phase, but there is not in the conception of this organization. The Red Cross at no time has undertaken, and I think I am correct in saying that it does not wish to undertake, large-scale relief. It is not equipped to do it, and it does not want to do it. What it is interested in is in the medical aspects of relief, the medical services, and the care of children and old people.

Senator VANDENBERG. Would there be any conflict at that point between U. N. R. R. A. and the American Red Cross?

Mr. Acheson. No; I do not think there would. The U. N. R. R. A. agreement itself provides that any organization working in any territory shall do so with the consent and the approval of the Director General, and it is up to him therefore to get together with all these agencies and work out with each one what its appropriate job is.

Senator VANDENBERG. Has there been any sort of complaint at any time from the American Red Cross regarding the scope of U. N. R. R. A.?

Mr. Acheson. Not that I know of.

I simply wanted to make the record complete, Mr. President, upon that thoroughly pertinent point.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should like to ask the Senator if the M. E. R. A. was given any consideration?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator explain those letters so that I may know what he is talking about?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I refer to the Middle East Relief Association.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am unable to say.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say that it was highly proper to make, and I am very glad that the Senator from Michigan has made, the correction as to any conclusion that might be drawn from the RECORD in my reply to the Senator from Tennessee. As suggested, I simply stated that no such discussion had taken place when I was present, which was true.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, yesterday I listened with a great deal of interest to what my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Gillette], had to say in opposition to the pending joint resolution known as House Joint Resolution 192. I say I listened to him with unusual interest because I share in his opinion and because I look upon him at this hour with a great deal of admiration and with entire inspiration, for it has been my observation that on every occasion he has evidenced and demonstrated his interest in America. In other words, I look upon him as one who is more thoroughly interested in America and its future than he is in any other country of the world.

It is refreshing to find myself in the presence of such a man, for the very reason that our Nation seems to be filled with those who are evidently more interested in saving the world than in saving America itself.

Mr. President, I wish to state at the outset, without the slightest hesitation, that I am for America first, and so long as I remain a Member of this body I shall vote the dictates of my conscience as they lead me toward the ultimate interests of this country ahead of the interests of any other country upon the face of the earth.

The Senator from Iowa stated to us yesterday that at the time the vote was taken in the Committee on Foreign Relations upon the pending joint resolution he was 1 member of the committee against 16; in other words, the ratio was 16 to 1, as he expressed it on the floor of the Senate. He was the only member of the committee who voted against reporting the joint resolution. I voted to report it, as the Senator will recall, but at the time I did so I stated to the chairman, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Connally], in the presence of the members of the committee, that I was voting to report the joint resolution to the Senate because I wanted the American people to have the benefit of our discussion in this body in reference to the matter, and at the same time I told the chairman that I reserved the privilege of voting against the joint resolution in the Senate if I so desired.

Mr. GILLETTE. Will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad the Senator from North Carolina referred to the colloquy which took place in the room of the Committee on Foreign Relations, because it occurred just exactly as he has stated. He announced at that time that he would probably oppose the proposal on the floor of the Senate. In referring to the classic ratio of 16 to 1 yesterday I perhaps did an injustice to the eminent Senator by suggesting that he had sup-

ported the joint resolution, when he merely supported reporting it to the Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator, but the Senator did not do me any injustice at all.

Mr. President, the joint resolution before the Senate calls for the expenditure of \$1,350,000,000. I shall not read or discuss the entire joint resolution. I shall confine my discussion largely to the interests of our country, and to the amount of money which is sought to be appropriated in carrying forward the objectives of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution is entitled, "Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization," and the first paragraph reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums, not to exceed \$1,350,000,000 in the aggregate, as the Congress may determine from time to time to be appropriate for participation by the United States (including contributions in funds or otherwise and all necessary expenses related thereto) in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, established by an agreement concluded by the United Nations and Associated Governments on November 9, 1943.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the joint resolution. I shall not vote \$1,350,000,000 of the money of the taxpayers of the United States of America to be used by any international organization; and this joint resolution, as explained by the able Senator from Iowa yesterday, is not a thing in the world but a measure to formulate an international organization for which, as I say, we will put up all the money.

The time has arrived, the hour has struck, when we must look after our own interests. Every person, soldier and civilian, who today sits in the galleries of the Senate, is interested in this subject, because if the joint resolution shall be enacted, whereby we by our respective votes will appropriate \$1,350,000,000 to this international organization, it will mean taking \$10 out of the pocket of every man, woman, and child in the United States, and that will be merely the beginning. In other words, I contend that the \$1,350,000,000 will mean nothing but an ante in the jackpot.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's trend of thought, but in connection with the statement he just made of the international character of the organization, let me interpolate that the First Assistant Director General to Governor Lehman, I understand, is Sir Arthur Salter, and that the assistant to the Director General for setting up the personnel in the Bureau of Special Areas in the international field, is Mr. Metchnikov, of the Soviet Union. In connection with the statement that Sir Arthur Salter is the First Assistant, and the discussion yesterday as to where relief would stop and rehabilitation and reconstruction start, I think it would be pertinent, and I know the Senator would be interested, to put into the RECORD a brief quotation from a speech made by Sir Arthur Salter just a

few weeks ago to an American group of farmer cooperatives. I do not certify to the accuracy of this quotation because it was handed to me only this morning, but it is as follows:

Whoever relieves will rebuild. Whoever rebuilds will formulate the pattern of government.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much indebted to the Senator. It is true that when we begin relief, we begin rehabilitation, and when we begin rehabilitation, we confront the question of financing the entire world.

As I stated a moment ago, someone has to be able to say "No." It appears that we are so accustomed to saying "Yes" to appropriations that it is difficult for some of us to say "No"; but, so far as I am concerned, I am saying "No" now. I do not propose to give away any more money that belongs to the taxpayers of this country, money which we will need, and when we make the appropriation of \$1,350,000,000 we are merely voting to put the hands of the Treasury of the United States into the pocket of every taxpayer in the United States and take therefrom \$10; and that is but the beginning.

Mr. President, who is going to pay for this international organization? The taxpayers of the United States of America. If we do not stop this willful, sinful waste of money which belongs to the American people, the United States will be bankrupt.

Is it true that the United States is going to pay for all of it? Let us see. It is said that 44 countries will participate in this international relief program. I wish to give the names of the 44 countries which are going to participate in it. I obtained them from the report. They are: The Commonwealth of Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, the United States of Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, the French Committee of National Liberation, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Luxembourg, the United Mexican States, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippine Commonwealth, Poland, the Union of South Africa, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, we are called upon to pay \$1,350,000,000, which is two-thirds of the entire amount to be put up by all 44 nations, and, although we are called upon to put up two-thirds of the money, we have but one-fourth of the total vote in the affairs of the organization. In other words, despite the fact that we are putting up two-thirds of all the money which is to be contributed initially to this world-wide, power-politics international organization, we have but 1 vote out of 44 votes which are to be cast by the Council itself.

Mr. President, I say we are putting up more than two-thirds. Who is going to pay for it all? The United States of America is going to pay for the whole

thing, just as the United States of America is paying for the whole war and for the rehabilitation of the whole world. Let us see whether that is so. We have what is called lend-lease. Last night when I left the Senate I called up the Lend-Lease Division of the State Department. I contacted a very courteous gentleman, who very kindly gave me the information I sought—Mr. East, of Lend-Lease, whose telephone number is Executive 7030, extension 707. I asked him to tell me which of the countries that are participating or about to participate in this world international organization were receiving lend-lease from us, and I found that every single one of the 44 countries which are supposed to put up one-third of the money in this international enterprise is today receiving lend-lease money from us.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator would except Canada, would he not? Canada is not receiving lend-lease from us.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am coming to that.

Mr. AIKEN. But Canada is included in the list of 44 countries.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is true. I am coming to that, I will say to the Senator. Every single country of those who are supposed to put up the one-third is receiving lend-lease from us today, with the exception of the Philippine Commonwealth and Canada. Canada, so I have been informed, pays cash for all the stuff she receives from us.

Mr. President, I asked Mr. East about Liberia, and he stated that he did not know whether or not Liberia was receiving any lend-lease, but I understand that Liberia has received several million dollars which we have poured in there by reason of her aid in the war. I therefore argue that we are not only called upon to put up \$1,350,000,000 but that we are giving money, we are giving lend-lease, to every single one of the 44 countries, with the exception of Canada.

Mr. President, I am vitally interested now in saving as much as we can of Uncle Sam's money, because I am afraid that one of these days we will wake up and find ourselves a bankrupt nation. At the present time we have a national debt of approximately \$300,000,000,000, and I venture to say without the slightest hesitation that within 2 years we will have a national debt of \$500,000,000,000. I am anxious to save all the money we can save for ourselves, in order that we may care for our own when the time comes that we must do so, for we shall be called upon to take care of our heroes when they shall have returned from the 72 posts at which they are stationed around the world.

Mr. President, we are now in desperate financial condition. I heard the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, state on the floor of the Senate the other day that we have not only scraped clean the bottom of the pot, but that we had scraped it clean 100 times. Today we find that all we can raise in additional taxes is a bit over \$2,000,000,000, whereas the administration and the

Treasury Department have called for the raising of more than \$10,000,000,000 of additional taxes. Yet here we are, in the desperate straits in which we find ourselves financially, proposing to give to an international organization, over which we have no direction, 1 percent of our national income.

Mr. President, I am interested in the boys who are to be returned to the United States. Someone said the other day that when the war is over, and when the men and women in uniform return to American shores, from every part of the world, that for the next 50 years no one will be elected to public office unless he or she has worn the uniform abroad, and that perhaps will be well for the country, since the men and women who in every part of the world are fighting and helping to keep America American, to save America for Americans, are going to make their demands upon this great Nation, and their demands will be based upon their conception of all they believe to be right and for the best interests of the United States of America.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Did I understand the Senator to say that the present national debt was \$300,000,000,000?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I say the present national debt and authorizations are in excess of \$300,000,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Does the Senator have a break-down of this sum?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No; I do not, but I will be very glad to obtain it for the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I wonder if the Senator would procure the break-down and place it in the Record in connection with his remarks?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be very glad to do so. I refer to total appropriations and authorizations. I repeat that within 2 years perhaps, and certainly before the war shall have ended, we shall have a national debt in excess of \$500,000,000,000. What I am interested in is saving something for the men who are fighting to keep America American. What I am interested in is saving something with which to care for our soldiers, sailors, and other members of the armed forces—men and women—all over the world who are fighting to save America.

Let us see, Mr. President. We talk much about the soldiers, we brag of them, we pay high tributes to them; but what I want to do is back up those tributes and back up those declarations by action. By that I mean saving something to care for the men who will be returned to this land blind, armless, legless, maimed, sick, incapacitated, and to care for the widows and the orphans this horrible war has made and will yet make. When we became engaged in this war, almost 25 years after World War No. 1, we did not have enough beds in our hospitals to provide hospitalization for the veterans of World War No. 1. In preparation for this war we have made installation, or at least have planned for the installation, of 100,000 beds in hospitals. I am told that now the program will have to be in-

creased and I surmise it will have to be increased to the extent of providing for the installation of 300,000 beds in our hospitals.

We are voting billions of dollars almost daily, and we speak of billions as we used to speak of millions, until the national debt is rising to such a point that it is becoming dangerous, insofar as perhaps it will be beyond our ability to care for those who will return from the war. Let us see. Today millions of our men and women are in uniform. It will be our duty to care for the sons, the husbands, the sisters, and the wives who are serving our country today and who are in uniform. When they come back hundreds of thousands of them will be maimed, blind, and deranged. It will be our duty to care for those veterans, and it will be our duty to care for those who are made widows and orphans by this war. If we continue spending money as we are spending it now, I wonder how we shall be able to care for men who are expecting us to be able to care for them in their physical misery, and who are expecting us to be able to care for their families when they are no longer able to earn a living for them.

Mr. President, some days ago I talked to Mr. Millard W. Rice, who formerly was legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Today he is national service director of the Disabled American Veterans. I shall read a summary of a statement he made a few days ago before a committee:

More than 850,000 will be discharged with disabilities as the result of active service during World War No. 2, if the proportions of World War No. 1 are repeated, according to a statement made by Millard W. Rice, national service director of the Disabled American Veterans, recently before the Senate Committee on Finance, and on the basis of the same proportions, 1,250,000 World War No. 2 veterans will be in receipt of pensions for service-connected disabilities by 1970. But, the percentage of service-disabled veterans of World War No. 2 will very likely be more than out of World War No. 1, in view of the fact that World War No. 2 is a tougher and longer war, being fought on many more fronts, with the end not yet in sight. It, therefore, appears not out of reason to estimate that there might be anywhere from 1,250,000 to 2,500,000 wounded and disabled veterans out of World War 2.

Their care will impose a tremendous responsibility upon the Veterans' Administration, which demands an extensive expansion of its facilities. Therefore, the Veterans' Administration ought not to be imposed with the many proposed post-war adjustments for able-bodied veterans. Since first things should be taken care of first, the Veterans' Administration should remain the one governmental agency charged primarily with the responsibility of providing governmental benefits for America's service disabled and their dependents, without also being given the responsibility of providing for the various types of post-war adjustments for able-bodied discharges.

That was a statement by Mr. Millard W. Rice, national service director of the Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. President, I have before me a statement in reference to the subject matter under discussion. I desire to bring it to the attention of the Members of this body. We are perfectly willing to provide the unfortunates of Europe

or of any other part of the world with such aid as we may be able to provide. We wish to provide the starving with food; we wish to provide the ill with medicine; we wish to do all we possibly can do for the unfortunates of the world. But we have arrived at the point where it appears to me that the one nation and the one people of all the world who are doing everything for the world are the taxpayers of the United States of America. I think we have done our part; I think we are doing our part; and we have done our part, and have continued to do our part, for a long time past.

Let us see. Not so long ago there were hundreds of organizations in the United States for the purpose of providing relief for Russia, for France, for Poland, for Czechoslovakia, for almost every other country in the world. There were so many such organizations and so much money was being collected from time to time that someone in America suggested that there be organized a similar organization for the relief of Americans themselves.

Only a few days ago I read a newspaper account of a private relief organization in New York which had sent many hundreds of thousands of dollars to Russia, and tons upon tons of clothing, medicine, and other supplies. So, for years past we have been collecting money and sending it to all the other countries of the world, and I think we have done our part insofar as such relief is concerned. We have helped our allies. We are cooperating with our allies. We are bearing more than our share of the war. We are giving our sons, our daughters, and our dogs. Even before we got into the war we gave England a number of destroyers. Even before the declaration of war we sent our sons out of the Western Hemisphere. Even before we got into the war we had men in England, Iceland, and Greenland.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether the Senator saw the statement which was published in the newspapers the other day attributed to Mr. Sulzberger, owner and publisher of the New York Times. When the Senator was speaking of lend-lease, I was reminded of that statement. It will be recalled that Mr. Sulzberger, of the New York Times, was one of the most ardent supporters of lend-lease. It will also be recalled that those who were in favor of lend-lease were saying that lend-lease was for the purpose of keeping us out of war. That was said to be the purpose. It was not for the purpose of getting us into war. The other day, in speaking to the Red Cross, of which he is one of the officers, Mr. Sulzberger made the statement that he was one of those individuals who believed that when we enacted the lend-lease law we went to war. He further stated that that was an act of war on the part of the United States.

I should like to have the Senator recall that that was exactly the statement which I made on the floor of the Senate. I said that when we voted for lend-lease we were voting for war. Now we find

some of the very persons who were the strongest advocates of lend-lease admitting what I said on the floor of the Senate, that when we voted for lend-lease we voted for war.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much obliged to the Senator. I saw that statement in the newspapers. In that connection, I recall that when we were discussing lend-lease on the floor of the Senate, before we entered the war, it was said that the purpose of lend-lease was to help Great Britain. I heard the Senator speak on several occasions, and my recollection is that the Senator said that the passage of the Lend-Lease Act was a declaration of war.

I am speaking of aiding those across the water, to show that we have done everything we can. We are giving our sons and daughters. We are giving our blood. We are giving billions of dollars and bankrupting our Nation to help our Allies. There is nothing cheap about us; we are going the whole hog. All we want to know is how far we must follow and what we are to encounter on the road.

I recall that we were called upon to help those across the sea by lifting the arms embargo. That meant that we would be permitted to manufacture guns and place them on ships and put them in the hands of our friends across the seas so that they could kill their enemies. The able Senator from Montana voted against lifting the arms embargo. The able Senator from Montana stated at that time that if we lifted the arms embargo we would be an accessory to the crime; that we would be equally guilty, and equally involved, and that that was the first step toward war. The able Senator from Montana did not want the country to get into the war, and he voted against lifting the arms embargo.

Then came the proposal to repeal the neutrality law. We wanted to help the peoples of the world with whom we were in sympathy. A few months before we had enacted a neutrality law to keep us out of war. Then it was said, "If you will repeal the neutrality law, that will take us away from war." The Senator from Montana said that it would take us another step toward war, and the Senator from Montana voted against the proposal, because he knew that it would lead us to war.

Then came lend-lease. The Senator from Montana said:

I will not vote for lend-lease, because it is nothing more nor less than a declaration of war. It will take us into war, and we do not want war. We do not want our sons and daughters killed.

The Senator from Montana voted against it. Others said that all those steps were taking us away from war. Well, we are in war.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator will remember Mr. Herbert Agar, who was one of the leaders in the movement in support of the foreign policy of the administration, and one of the strongest proponents of lend-lease. He was also a proponent of the repeal of the arms embargo, and other measures,

Immediately after we enacted the lend-lease law, Mr. Agar made a speech in Boston and he quoted what I had said, and what other Members of the Senate had said. He said that I was correct. Other Senators had said that it was an act of war, virtually a declaration of war. Mr. Agar said that the statement made by those who said that it was for the purpose of keeping this country out of war was wrong, and that they were misrepresenting the facts to the American people. I stated that he said they were misrepresenting the facts. He used even stronger language than that.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much obliged to the Senator for his observations. I recall the matters to which he refers. I voted against lifting the arms embargo. I believed that such a step was a step toward war. I voted against the repeal of the neutrality law, because I knew it was a step toward war. I voted against lend-lease because I knew it would take us into war. I am glad I voted as I did. I recall that at that time the able Senator from Montana and I were both cussed from one end of the world to the other. We were called Nazis, Fascists, copperheads, appeasers, traitors, and everything else.

Why was the Senator from Montana called all those ugly names? Simply because he voted according to the dictates of his conscience, which led him to believe that those acts were steps toward war. The Senator from Montana did not want us to get into war. I mention that merely to show that we are doing all we possibly can; but we should not pauperize and bankrupt ourselves to help someone else. The time has arrived when we must start voting for the United States of America and quit trying to save the world.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. A short time ago I happened to be at a dinner where a lady said to me, "You talk like an America Firster." I replied, "What are you—an America seconder? It seems to me that you must either be for this country first, or for this country second. Whether you are for this country or for some other country, I am glad to have it said that I am for America first, rather than for America second."

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much.

Under the lease-lend operations we have taken from the taxpayers of America billions upon billions of dollars and given them freely to all the nations of the world. I do not hesitate to say that in my opinion we shall never get back a dollar of it. We have given billions upon billions of dollars of the people's money to other nations of the world. We are not "chinchy," we are not cheap; we are very liberal. It seems to me that sometimes we are too liberal with the taxpayers' money.

Furthermore we have put into uniform more than 10,000,000 men and women, who are now scattered throughout the entire world. They are as brave a group

of men and women as the world has ever known.

Moreover, labor in this country has produced more during this war than the combined production of the Axis, or the combined production of our allies. We have done the greatest production job that any country has ever done. We have produced more than any other country in the world, or any combination of countries. We have provided ships by the millions of tons, with which to transport food, medicines, munitions, and everything else to our allies. As I stated a moment ago, hundreds of private charities are now in operation, and our generous, big-hearted people are contributing to them from time to time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, the Senator realizes that these exertions of the United States—that is to say, the billions of dollars contributed by way of lend-lease, and the billions of dollars spent by charities in buying goods, which billions of dollars have been contributed during this period, are now counted into the expanded national income in the formula set up by U. N. R. R. A. for the purpose of still further penalizing the United States.

In other words, the formula set up by U. N. R. R. A. is on the basis of a percentage of the national income of each country. Therefore, both things work against us. The expanded national income, by reason of the increased production which we have brought about to give the other countries lend-lease and charity, and also the more favorable exchange position which the United States has come to have by reason of that same operation, give an entirely fictitious national income to the United States in comparison with other nations. So it is my belief that instead of 65 percent of all the world relief, which it has been admitted the United States will bear, we shall be bearing actually somewhat in excess of 90 percent, when we consider the expansion of our national income due to lend-lease and the more favorable exchange position created by the same operation.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much obliged for the observations of the Senator from Missouri.

As I said a moment ago, in line with what the Senator from Missouri has said, instead of paying two-thirds of the expense we shall be paying about 90 percent of it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me one further observation, we are asked to authorize an appropriation of \$1,350,000,000. I think most of us realize that that is merely an initial appropriation. While the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] spoke

truly yesterday when he said that it is limited by the terms of the measure under consideration to this one appropriation—nevertheless we are being asked to set our feet on a course, and we shall have to pay the whole bill.

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that if this one initial expenditure of \$1,350,000,000 were to be spent in the United States—to use one example, if it were applied to flood control in the Mississippi Valley, it would put the whole valley with all its tributaries beyond the danger of flood. The venture would pay for itself in 8 or 10 years, and render magnificent dividends in perpetuity from then on.

I believe that we owe a certain obligation to feed the desperate people of stricken countries. Nevertheless, when we talk about appropriating \$1,350,000,000, and paying approximately 90 percent of the total cost, after all is said and done, we are dissipating a very considerable portion of our national assets.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much. I think the Senator and I see eye to eye on this matter. The time has come when we must think at least a little about the United States of America.

In addition to that, let us see what else there is. We are scattering billions of dollars over the face of the earth. The other day a Senator stated that we had put about \$6,000,000,000 in Central and South America. Our armies which are now in Europe are buying up millions of tons of foodstuffs and spending millions upon millions of dollars for continued purchasing of foodstuffs for the purpose of feeding civilian populations and taking care of emergencies as they arise. As I have already stated, we now have before us a joint resolution to authorize the appropriation of \$1,350,000,000. That would be merely the ante. It would be only the beginning. The next thing will be rehabilitation. The joint resolution evidently means rehabilitation, because the words "relief and rehabilitation" appear in the title.

After that we shall have a world-wide bank. We have about \$21,000,000,000 in gold buried in Kentucky. It has been suggested that we organize an international bank, a world-wide bank. That suggestion has been made by many persons across the sea because they want us to set up a bank so that they can all borrow money from us. We shall be called upon to rehabilitate the whole world.

Since this war began many of the countries of Europe have called upon us to help them. Since the war began on September 3, 1939, more than 600,000 aliens from European countries have come into the United States. They have left their native countries, ignored the interests of their nations, and have come to the United States, where they can bask in the sunshine of prosperity and safety instead of staying at home and looking after the interests of their respective countries. Six hundred thousand of them have come over here while our men and women in uniform have gone to their countries to fight over

there for their national interests and the "four freedoms." We have been good to them.

In addition to all that, I read in the newspaper just the other day of the organization of another war relief agency. The Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson; the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau; and someone else constitute a committee of three. As I understand, their proposal is to bring into this country more persons from foreign countries.

In other words, we are pouring money out of our National Treasury, scraping it dry more than a hundred times, as stated by the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the other day, skyrocketing our national debt to the point where perhaps we will not have money enough to pay pensions to widows, or care for our own armless, legless, and blind soldiers. We are giving our money away and at the same time permitting aliens from all parts of the world to come here and obtain jobs. Whether or not they come in on a temporary visa, once they get here they will never go back, and they will occupy the jobs which our soldiers and heroes of this war should have.

I again assert that the time has arrived for us to speak out in behalf of and in the interest of more than 10,000,000 of our men and women who are now in uniform, even if we do not care anything about the people who are paying the taxes. We should save American jobs for American citizens.

Before we got into this war we said in effect, "It is going to be wonderful." Many friends of mine came from North Carolina to see me. I remember one friend of mine from Greensboro, N. C., who was then with the collector of internal revenue. He called upon me and said, "Bob, I am joining up tomorrow. I will see you in a few months." I said, "How so?" He replied, "Why, we will whip the whole world in 6 months."

We have been in the war more than 2 years and we have not yet got started. We do not know where or when the war will end. We do not know how long it will take. Yet we are being asked to appropriate billions of dollars to be contributed to an international organization which is not under our control.

Consider what is happening in Italy today. After we had won northern Africa and Tunisia we were led to believe that we would sweep Italy without any difficulty whatsoever. We have been marking time there, mired down for weeks, which is attributable largely to the elements, for no braver men ever fought than our men. Consider that General MacArthur issued a statement the other day that winning the war against Japan was not a question of merely jumping from island to island right into Tokyo. We do not know how long the war is going to last; we do not know how many of our sons and daughters are going to be killed and buried beneath foreign soil, thousands upon thousands of miles away from home. We do not know how many thousands of our sons and daughters are coming back de-

ranged, without legs or arms, and of no benefit to themselves or their families, except for their presence. Yet we propose to vote \$1,350,000,000, 1 percent of our national revenue, to an international organization.

What about the international organization? I wonder how much it is going to cost. I should like to know something about the administrative expense of it. I asked the able Senator from Michigan yesterday how much Governor Lehman, the Director General, was going to get. He said he did not know and did not care. Well, I do not know, but I do care. Insofar as I am concerned, I want to save every penny we can for the rehabilitation of our boys and girls, men and women in uniform, when they come back, whether it be a year or 5 years from now. I want to have a nest egg for them, and that is why I want to save the money for them, and that is why I want to save the jobs for them.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I hold in my hand the veto message of the President of the United States, dated May 22, 1935, of a bill that was passed by the Congress of the United States, House bill 3896, to provide for the immediate payment to veterans of the face value of their adjusted-service certificates, and so forth. I should like to call the attention of the Senator, if I may, to one or two statements which were made by the President at that time. He said:

The second "whereas" clause, which states that the payment of certificates will not create an additional debt, raises a fundamental question of sound finance. To meet a claim of one group by this deceptively easy method of payment will raise similar demands for the payment of claims of other groups. It is easy to see the ultimate result of meeting recurring demands by the issuance of Treasury notes. It invites an ultimate reckoning in uncontrollable prices and in the destruction of the value of savings that will strike most cruelly those like the veterans who seem to be temporarily benefited. The first person injured by skyrocketing prices is the man on a fixed income. Every disabled veteran on pension or allowance is on fixed income. This bill favors the able-bodied veteran at the expense of the disabled veteran.

Wealth—

The President said—

is not created, nor is it more equitably distributed by this method. A Government, like an individual, must ultimately meet legitimate obligations out of the production of wealth by the labor of human beings applied to the resources of nature.

The President of the United States never made a more direct and frank statement than that of the economics of finance.

Wealth is not created, nor is it more equitably distributed by this method. A government, like an individual, must ultimately meet legitimate obligations out of the production of wealth by the labor of human beings applied to the resources of nature. Every country that has attempted the form of meeting its obligations which is here provided has suffered disastrous consequences.

The President in his veto message then referred to what would happen to the Treasury. He said:

Some years ago it was well said by the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho that, "The soldier of this country cannot be aided except as the country itself is rehabilitated. The soldier cannot come back except as the people as a whole come back. The soldier cannot prosper unless the people prosper. He has now gone back and intermingled and become a part of the citizenship of the country; he is wrapped up in its welfare or in its adversity. The handing out to him of a few dollars will not benefit him under such circumstances, whereas it will greatly injure the prospects of the country and the restoration of normal conditions."

I cite that to show that at that time the President was worried about the payment of the soldiers' bonus because of the effect it would have upon inflation and the financial condition of the country.

I happened to be a Member of the Senate at that time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Did not the President veto the soldiers' bonus?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the President vetoed it, and I am reading from the veto message which he sent to the Congress at that time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. He said we did not have sufficient money to pay it, did he not, and that it would create inflation?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; that the bill would create an inflation if enacted at that time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. What amount of money did the bonus involve?

Mr. WHEELER. About \$2,000,000,000, as I recall.

I call attention to that fact because at that time we were seeking to pay a contract to the soldiers which we had agreed to pay, but to pay it to them in advance of the time when it matured. That was vetoed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator permit an interruption at that point, with the permission of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was justifiable on the ground that the Government had not made the contract until 5 or 6 years after the time when the money was fairly owed to the soldiers. The Government had entered into a contract to pay the bonus at maturity, the provisions of the bill which the Senator is now discussing provided for payment before maturity. If the bonus had been given to the men when they were discharged from the Army, in the first place, the time at which it was fairly owed, a large saving would have resulted.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator was entirely correct as to the theory on which the President was proceeding, but the actual facts were that the measure which the President vetoed simply brought the contract to maturity at a time before it would have been brought to maturity under the terms of the contract which had been entered into. If the Government had made the contract

at the time it should have entered into it there would have been a very considerable saving.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sure the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from North Carolina will recall the statements made upon this floor and the statements made in the reactionary press of the country to the effect that the payment of the bonus at that time would wreck the country, that to pay the soldiers \$2,000,000,000 would cause a tremendous inflation. That was the language used by the press and the President of the United States at that time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, what was the national debt at that time, does the Senator know? It was about \$20,000,000,000, was it not?

Mr. WHEELER. As I recall, it was between twenty and thirty billion dollars.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Between twenty and thirty billion dollars?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. President, the bill which was vetoed was to pay a debt which we owed to the soldiers and which we had agreed to pay.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I voted for it, and I voted to override the President's veto.

Mr. WHEELER. So did I.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wanted the soldiers to have some money then, and it is a good thing the Congress gave it to them then because I am afraid we will not have any left for them in this war.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; if we are going to give the resources of this country away to foreign countries. I want to say that nobody on the floor of the Senate is more in sympathy with the unfortunate people and the refugees of stricken countries than am I, and I am perfectly willing to do whatever is necessary to help rehabilitate those countries and put back on their feet their people who have been ruthlessly driven from their homes by Mr. Hitler and his group. But I say that in doing that we are the trustees of the taxpayers' money. If we give away the substance of the taxpayers and burden the Senator's children and my children, and our grandchildren for the next 150 or 200 years, we will pauperize the American people, we will have to turn to the printing press, as Mr. Roosevelt intimated we would have to do if we gave the soldiers the \$2,000,000,000 bonus; or we will have to repudiate our debt, because we will not be able to service it if it keeps on rising by leaps and bounds, as it has been doing.

First, we are to give the President of the United States \$1,300,000,000 to be turned over to a group of 44 different countries, to be used as they see fit, when we have only 1 vote in the body, without any strings to it whatsoever; and when they once get it they will have authority, under the proposed legislation, to make contracts and more contracts, and commitments and more commitments, and then they will come back to this country and say, "We have already made these commitments. While you have authorized only \$1,300,000,000, you are morally bound, under the provisions of the act, to give us more money

and more money and more money to carry out the provisions of the act which you approved."

In the first place, if we are to pass anything at all, we should limit the amount to less than \$1,300,000,000, until we ascertain whether that much will be needed. Secondly, we should call on the President of the United States, to whom the money is to be turned over, to make quarterly reports to the Congress as to where the money is being spent and how it is being spent. For Congress just to turn over to any President unlimited sums of money, to be spent as he or someone else he delegates may see fit, would involve a violation of the oath of office which every Senator took to uphold the Constitution of the United States and protect the interests of the people of the United States, when they took their seats in this body.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall not violate my oath.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I call his attention to the fact that under the remarkable set-up proposed, there are managing members and contributing members, and we are to be the principal contributing member, not only the principal one, but the controlling member, in the matter of contributions. It is admitted we are supposed to contribute 65 percent of the expenses of this organization. But other nations, some of which, for very good reasons, are not expected to contribute to the expenses of the operation, are permitted, by paying a modicum of the expenses of administration, to have the same voice in the administration of the fund that we have. For instance, the Russians. I have the very deepest and heartfelt admiration for the military achievements of the Russians. They do not think they should be included as contributing members, and I think there is very much in what they say, that they have a tremendous problem of rehabilitation themselves. They have been through the treadmill, they have been through the fiery furnace, and they say they should not be expected to contribute to the rehabilitation of some of the other countries, but if they should not contribute to the rehabilitation of some of the other countries, why should they have an equal voice with the United States in the administration of the funds by the contribution of a mere million and a quarter dollars to the administrative expenses?

It does not seem to me to be right, in the first place, that all contributing members should have the same voice in the administration, without regard to the amounts they contribute. In the second place, it does not seem to be right that noncontributing members should have the same voice as we, who will probably contribute three-fourths to the whole enterprise before we get through.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much obliged to the Senator. Of course, some of the countries are making contributions toward the administrative expenses.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think they should put up some of the administrative expenses, but the idea that the United

States should have no greater voice in this matter than noncontributing nations seems to me unjustifiable. But after we once enact this proposal, Congress will have really signed off, they will not have much more to do with it, because it will be a commitment, no matter what the distinguished Senator from Michigan said yesterday. Although an American, and a very distinguished American, has been selected to be the head of the organization as an initial proposition, we are to have no more voice in the management of the concern, after contributing \$1,300,000,000, than our friends the Russians, who are contributing a million and a quarter to the administrative expenses. That does not seem to me to hold together.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREEN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I read now the contributions, by percentages, of the various governments to the total amount of \$10,000,000, decided on as the necessary administrative expenses:

	Percentage
Australia.....	1.50
Belgium.....	1.00
Bolivia.....	.10
Brazil.....	1.50
Canada.....	3.00
Chile.....	.20
China.....	5.00
Colombia.....	.30
Costa Rica.....	.05
Cuba.....	.20
Czechoslovakia.....	1.00
Dominican Republic.....	.05
Ecuador.....	.05
Egypt.....	.70
El Salvador.....	.05
Ethiopia.....	.05
French Committee of National Liberation.....	4.00

Where are they to get the money?

	Percentage
Greece.....	0.50
Guatemala.....	.05
Haiti.....	.05

Haiti will have one vote the same as the United States will have.

	Percentage
Honduras.....	0.05
Iceland.....	.05
India.....	4.00
Iran.....	.10
Iraq.....	.10
Liberia.....	.05
Luxemburg.....	.05
Mexico.....	.70
Netherlands.....	1.50
New Zealand.....	.30
Nicaragua.....	.05
Norway.....	.30
Panama.....	.05
Paraguay.....	.05
Peru.....	.25
Philippines.....	.05
Poland.....	1.00
Union of South Africa.....	1.00
U. S. S. R.....	15.00
United Kingdom.....	15.00
U. S. A.....	40.00
Uruguay.....	.20
Venezuela.....	.10
Yugoslavia.....	.70

Total..... 100.00

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator from North Carolina will permit another interruption, there is nothing in the joint resolution, as I read it, or in the whole set-up, which would prevent the other governments from paying their contributions, if they desire, out of lend-lease funds. We may be paying 100 percent before we get through.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I might state to the Senator, in that connection, that I called up the State Department last night, the lend-lease division, and found that every member of the 44 nations which are supposed to make contributions to relieve the suffering of the world is getting lend-lease, except Canada and Liberia. So, as the Senator has ably stated, these other countries can pay their part out of the money we give them. So we wind up by paying it all, just as we are going to wind up in everything else.

Mr. WHEELER. The following is a provision found in article X as to voting:

Each member government represented on the Council or on any of its committees or subcommittees shall have only one vote.

In other words we will have the same vote that Nicaragua will have, and the same vote Liberia will have.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In other words, we will have only one vote out of 44.

Mr. WHEELER. Whether we are to contribute all the money, or 40 percent or 60 percent—and I venture the assertion that we will contribute far more than 40 percent, because some of the other countries cannot contribute anything unless the money comes out of lend-lease—the other countries will have just as much to say as the United States when it comes to voting, as to where the money is to be spent, and how it is to be spent.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Absolutely, and I wish to make this further statement to the Senator in reference to the expenditure and distribution of the money: Russia will not be contributing anything in the way of money or supplies which are proposed to be distributed to the unfortunate people involved, as the Senator from Montana understands. Russia is simply aiding by way of contributing toward the administrative expenses. If the Senator will bear with me a moment, I believe I shall be able to show him that most of the money in question will go to Russia; that none of it will go to the Philippines. The Philippines are now under the direction of the Japanese. Neither is there mention of Singapore, Malaya, Java, Sumatra, Bali or China. None of those places or countries are mentioned. All the proposed aid is intended for relief in Europe. Who is going to have charge of Europe? The Senator from Montana knows who will have charge of Europe after the war is over.

Mr. WHEELER. Does anyone question who will control or dominate Europe after the war is over?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly Russia is going to dominate Europe.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Stalin is going to own all of Europe and control all of Asia.

He has already said he is going to take part of Finland, part of Poland, part of Rumania, and all of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bessarabia. We know that one of the difficulties in Italy today arises from the fighting and the intrigue which is going on between the Fascists and the Communists over who shall have control after the war. One of the great troubles we find in Yugoslavia today, according to all reports we receive, results from the fact that the Communists and the Fascists there are at outs with one another. They are now fighting over who is to control Yugoslavia after the war, the Fascists or the Communists. It will all wind up in Mr. Stalin having control of all of Europe and there will be a renewal of the revolution in Spain after Franco is knocked off. Russia will have control of all of Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Greece.

All the money it is now proposed that we provide will go to those countries. That is one danger about the matter. To whom will the money be given? It must be distributed over there. With whom will those who will distribute the money side? When it comes to dealing with Yugoslavia are those who have the matter in charge going to side with the young king's friends or with Mr. Stalin's representatives? The relief administration we are considering is one of the greatest instrumentalities of power politics we can possibly place in any one's hands.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not think we will have much to say respecting who will control Europe after the war is over. At this time it is very difficult to predict who will control Europe. But when we think of all the suffering there will be after the war is over we may reasonably conclude the chances to be that Russia will dominate Europe.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. I am opposed to the Fascists or the Nazis controlling Europe, but I also dislike to see the Communists run Europe. What I should like to see set up in Europe is some form of a united nations of Europe which would be based upon a democratic form of government similar to the one we have in the United States of America. I think it should be the aim of the United States to try to bring about some form of a united states of Europe, or at least something along that line, after the war is over. But I doubt whether we will have very much to say about the matter, because I think the actions of Russia heretofore have indicated both to Mr. Churchill and to the United States that Russia is going to pursue a course which she thinks is in her best interest, and that she is going to tell us in so many words that it is practically none of our business what position she takes with reference to Finland, Poland, and other countries. If that takes place, there may be some persons who will want to go to war with Russia before this thing is

over; but, so far as I am concerned, I shall be just as jealous to keep our country out of war with Russia after the present war is over as I was in trying to keep the country out of the present war before we got into it. If Russia dominates Europe, which I think she will to a very large extent, there will be those in this country who will want us to go to war with Russia, but I shall not be one of them.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not know about that. I think many persons who were crying, "War, war; let us go to war," before we went into this war, have had a bellyful of it. When we get through with this war, and have hundreds of thousands of our soldiers killed, and millions of them wounded, and not enough hospitals to take care of them, and when the country has no money with which to take care of them, and when our people will be broke, as they will be, and sick at heart because of the loss of our loved ones who are buried in the cold soil of foreign countries—then, Mr. President, I think those who were yelling, "War, war; let us have war," will have had a bellyful.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think that before we get out of the international mess in which we find ourselves the American people will come back to good old American nationalism. By that I mean that they will come back to thinking about their own soil.

We hear a great deal about rehabilitating the world, and what we are going to do after the war, and all this and that. What I should like to hear from some of the candidates for President is their pronouncement with respect to what their position is concerning world affairs. I think the candidates for President should let the people know where they stand with respect to international matters, and let the people know where we are now, and what our position is with respect to the rest of the world. Let us ask of each of the candidates, "Are you an American nationalist? Are you first for America? Are you first for your own country, or are you going to think about other countries first, and after that be for your own country?"

We ought to have a show-down between the interventionists, the internationalists, the world "globalonists" and starry-eyed pinks, all that crowd, and the America firsters and American nationalists.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator means those who are for America first and those who are for America second?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. President, I shall conclude in a moment. I wish to read something which John Marshall said:

When our own people are free from poverty and want and malnutrition it will be time enough to begin to plan to permanently suckle the world at the expense of American taxpayers.

He also very rightfully said:

The power to tax is the power to destroy.

Thomas Jefferson, who lived in Virginia and about whom we hear a great

deal, but whose principles are not very widely followed or practiced, said:

It is the duty of the people to support the Government. It is not the duty of the Government to support the people. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them, they must become happy.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Practical Help—or Sappy Sentiment?" The one who sent it to me did not say in what newspaper it was printed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRACTICAL HELP—OR SAPPY SENTIMENT?

"Hottentot Internationalism" is the apt label that William P. Witherow, chairman of the board of the National Association of Manufacturers, pinned on all those schemes to leave a bottle of milk on the doorstep of every house from northwest China to Spitzbergen.

This Hottentot internationalism, for which the American taxpayer will be asked to sweat out the money, is also the emotional base of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which is beneficent and humane in purpose, but which will, like so many beneficent and human contraptions of squandermaniacs and professional dogoodies, in the end make millions of Europeans and Asiatics dependent on our Treasury indefinitely.

In plain English, Hottentot internationalism will tend to make what is known as bums out of millions of persons who if left to themselves after the war might learn how to scramble to their feet in the pre-New Deal American way.

THE MEANING AND DANGER

Mr. Witherow expounded the meaning and the danger of Hottentot internationalism in these words in one of the liveliest and most unusual of the speeches made before the recent second war congress of American industry of the National Association of Manufacturers:

"Our compassion for a war-torn world should not fail to draw the line between sane benevolence and maudlin sentimentalism. Beyond that line lies the policy of Hottentot internationalism.

"A perpetual policy of free hand-outs for the world is not benevolence. It is a weakness—and of a dangerous sort. Sound charity stops at the point where it ceases to strengthen the recipient and encourages indolence. He who doles out charity beyond that point is not only deceiving himself, but he is cheating the one he thinks to help. And that is equally true whether the object of spurious charity be a sidewalk panhandler, a great nation, or a Hottentot.

"There are some who cling to the theory of Hottentot internationalism as our post-war policy. Although unfair, both to the American people and to the people it would pauperize, this attitude is still evident in some places."

It is evident in a good many places in the Washington regime.

In fact, this Hottentot internationalism seems to occupy the minds of almost every bureaucrat, Treasury bagman, and world superstatist in the National Capital.

It is all a part of the "mammy government" which they have partly succeeded in palming off on us in the last 10 years.

The U. N. R. R. A. is merely the N. R. A., Tugwellism, Ickesism and Hopkins' and Wallace's crackpotism played on world scale.

OUT TO REHABILITATE THE WORLD

They are out to rehabilitate the world, while it is America alone that should be the

first thought of professional weepers over the pantless Hottentots.

Mr. Witherow in the following defines the difference between maudlin sentimentality and practical philanthropy:

"Practical-minded Americans can see that the answer to the problem of the Hottentot is not to deliver a quart of milk to his doorstep every morning. The real answer is to help him find the way to a better life. Don't try to give it to him. Convince him of the value of effort, of the need for gathering a few more coconuts, and then buy these coconuts from him. Establish enterprise and trade. Then he can buy a cow of his own. With his cow and a few rhythmic motions he can be his own milkman. And instead of waiting for the international milkman—Uncle Sam—he can have not only a quart a day but a gallon a day."

In a word, let us help Europe and Asia get on their feet by pointing out to them that they have feet—that is, the will to come back by their own efforts.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD an article by a well-known writer, Mr. Benjamin de Casseres, entitled "That Is an American."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Books, magazines, the mouths of foreign lecturers, the editorial pages of newspapers, and the radio are cluttered up telling us who the Russians, the Chinese, the Germans, the Italians, and a dozen or so other peoples are and what their particular "cultures" and political "ideologies" should mean to us. They work like riveters on our skulls.

This knowledge may have a certain value. But isn't it time for the whole world—and some millions of Americans included—to find out—

WHAT IS AN AMERICAN?

St. John de Crevecoeur, a Frenchman who settled in America in the eighteenth century, was the first man to ask—in 1782—that overwhelmingly vital question in these words:

"What, then, is the American, this new man?"

In 1782 De Crevecoeur could not answer that question definitely, or he was too near the making of that new man—the American.

But today, 161 years afterward, I will undertake to reply to De Crevecoeur's question.

The American:

He feels the emotion of mental, moral, spiritual, and physical liberty in every corpse and atom of his body all the days of his life—

So much so that he would rather live on one meal a day and have freedom of speech and pen than have three meals a day and be enslaved.

He feels walking about in his soul the living spirits of Washington, Jefferson, Paine, and Lincoln on the political level and Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry D. Thoreau, and Walt Whitman on the literary-philosophical level, and he partakes of their doctrine of rugged pioneer individualism with the same exaltation of spirit that those seven mighty new men announced it.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

Knowing the immemorial crimes of the state and the crimes of a myriad of European and Asiatic rulers against the body and soul of the individual man and woman, he regards the state and all its blandishments and bribes for the purpose of absorbing him into its diabolic maw of suspicion—to say the least.

He sees in all forms of collectivism the enemy of his body and soul and of the United States, in whose traditional roots of individual liberty he lives.

In holding to his deeply grounded instincts and ideas and in clinging tenaciously to his Fourth of July emotions, he cannot be moved by sneers and epithets like "horse-and-buggy" and "reactionary."

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He is suspicious of any political or social idea that comes from Europe, whether it is labeled Lenin, Hegel, Marx, or Beveridge, that does not give him more liberty.

He knows that no idea that will make him a freer man politically and socially ever has, or ever will, come out of Europe.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He believes in his own unique destiny.

He believes that the grandeur and safety of his future lie in projecting himself along the routes of his past.

He combats with voice, pen, and vote all the alien-minded forms of public parasitism that are infecting the United States, whether they are called communism, fascism, state socialism, New Dealism, technocracy, or Beveridgeism.

He knows they are strangling hands out of Europe's and Asia's million-year-old charnel houses of war, slavery, and tortures.

He wars on them—peaceably if possible, physically if necessary.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He believes in tolerance. But he is intolerant of all groups—Fascist, Communist, Socialist—whose very existences depend on the extermination of all opponents.

He believes in equality before the law, but opposes tooth-and-nail all forms of artificial legalized equality created by demagogues for the purpose of pulverizing 135,000,000 persons to a common Marxian level.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He is the foe of New Deal bureaucracy, which he knows is a form of superconstitutional government which will, in the end, wind up in a master bureaucrat—a dictator.

He opposes with all the pride, dignity, and self-reliance of a deep-soil native of this land all doles, hand-outs, cradle-to-grave security bribes—except to the helpless, the sick, the incapacitated, and the congenital, incompetent bum.

He will never give up his right to criticize any public official, from the President down, either in war or peace.

He walks upright, fearlessly, eye-to-eye, belonging to a people that was the first on the planet to do so.

His spine was not made to crook or his knees for crawling before those in power.

He is self-made—that is, no political or ecclesiastical power molded him against his will.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He is for free enterprise, which is a right implied in every line of the Constitution, and is the very breath of article 1 of the Bill of Rights.

He believes in competitive business and personal rivalries, in emulation, and in contest as a spur to better and greater accomplishments. And the sharper the rivalries the better.

He believes in a reasonable protective tariff, as Jefferson and Hamilton did, to protect his high level of living against foreign coolie levels.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He fights and sweats out taxes today to maintain this new kind of country—a country toward which all people's hands are pathetically stretched and toward which nearly all governments have their prehensile "pickers and snatchers" moving.

He is not fighting for Russia, for China, for England, or for France.

He is not fighting to dissolve himself in a fetid international witches' cauldron called a "world state."

He is not a "citizen of the world."

He is not going to transport his American sovereignty to the Kremlin or to Downing Street or to Geneva or to Chungking.

He is for America first—always.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He remains seated with the founding fathers in Independence Hall and in Constitution Hall.

He remains a nationalist.

He spurns internationalism as a device to pick his pocket and to gag his mouth and paralyze his pen.

He is a self-determined, aggressive, ever-watchful being, suspicious and cynical of all that Europe and Asia promise us.

That is a United States American; that is a Yankee Doodle American.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to conclude by saying that I shall vote against the pending measure because it provides for an international organization, and that we shall have practically no say about the conduct of its affairs. When the proper time comes I shall submit a number of proposed amendments to the joint resolution. I propose to amend it by reducing the appropriation from \$1,350,000,000 to \$350,000,000.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana a question, with his permission.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Yesterday reference was made to resolution No. 12, on page 40 of the pamphlet entitled "First Session of the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration." Paragraph 5 of resolution No. 12, which was particularly referred to, I now read:

5. It is recommended that in cases where home production exceeds home consumption, the Government or recognized national authority concerned should take all steps necessary to enable the excess of production available in a country to be put at the disposal of other liberated areas which may need such supplies to cover their deficits.

With that in mind, I should like to make an observation, and then ask a question. We are to contribute approximately 60 or 65 percent, I think, of the fund; at least our contribution is to be in the amount of \$1,350,000,000. What authority will determine whether we have a surplus of production? If the authority set out in the resolution determines that we have a surplus of production, if it makes the determination in good faith, and if this particular organization constituted of 44 members, or some subcommittee thereof is the legal authority, what would there be to prevent this organization from coming into the United States now, immediately after it is set up, and becoming a competing organization along with Lend-Lease and other agencies to purchase foods which we badly need in this country, especially for our armed forces?

I ask that question for the reason that the Senator from Montana made some remarks yesterday about that phase of the subject when the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]

was speaking on the joint resolution. As I recall, paragraph 5 of resolution No. 12 was brought into the discussion, and the Senator from Montana made some reference to it.

The thing I am concerned about is this: We debated for several days the matter of consumer subsidies, because some felt strongly they would inflate prices. One of the organizations which has taken a great deal of our food and which has helped to inflate prices in this country has been the agency created under the Lend-Lease Act. Would not the force and effect of the creation of the agency proposed under the pending joint resolution be to place another competing agency in the field? If the new agency spent \$1,350,000,000, would not that in reality reduce our agricultural program of approximately \$8,000,000,000 nearly one-fourth? If that be true, it could create a hardship upon the consuming public in this country, and, in reality, we would be subsidizing the United Nations of the world, instead of helping our people at home.

If the statements I have just made throw any light on the question I should like to have the Senator from Montana answer. My question is asked in the light of the explanations made. I should like to have the Senator's reaction to the statements I have made and the questions I have asked.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, paragraph 5 of resolution No. 12 reads as follows:

5. It is recommended that in cases where home production exceeds home consumption, the Government or recognized national authority concerned should take all steps necessary to enable the excess of production available in a country to be put at the disposal of other liberated areas which may need such supplies to cover their deficits.

I assume that what is being referred to there is some liberated country which may have an overproduction or a production which exceeds its home consumption, and the thought is that such surplus should be used in other countries which do not have a surplus. It seems to me that other constructions could be put upon that language, however, since it is so broad that it could be interpreted in various ways. Nevertheless, that is the construction which I should say any reasonable body would place on it.

However, when we read paragraph 1 of resolution No. 12, on page 40, we find that it provides in part as follows:

1. Rehabilitation supplies are to consist of materials, such as raw materials, machinery, and spare parts needed to enable a recipient country to produce and transport relief supplies for its own and other liberated territories.

What does that mean? It means that the group to be formed under the joint resolution could buy machinery in one country and could set it up in other countries for use in those countries. If we examine the operations under lend-lease, the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act, and if we consider the amount of money we are furnishing through lend-lease to other countries at the present time, we find that far more of it is going

for other things than for war purposes; a far greater proportion is going, not for war, but for post-war uses.

For instance, I happen to know the president of a certain company in this country. He told me that his company—I will not give the exact figures—was sending to a certain country more than three-quarters of a billion dollars worth of equipment which was to be used, not as war materials, but for post-war rehabilitation, for the building of machinery and other articles to be used after the war.

Mr. President, perhaps my view is too narrow, and perhaps I am too old-fashioned. Of course, as I said earlier today, I greatly sympathize with the poor, unfortunate people of the invaded countries who are being driven from their homes and are being persecuted. In 1936, I returned from Europe and denounced Hitler for the persecution of the Jews that was occurring in Germany. I denounced him for it on many public platforms in this country. I have denounced the persecution of the Catholics in Mexico, and I have denounced every persecution of any class of people in any country on the face of the globe. But there comes a time when there is a limit to what the United States of America can give away for charitable or other purposes without dragging the great mass of the people of the United States down to a point where they will become beggars and paupers.

In this country there are some persons who think far more of Russia than they do of the United States. There are some persons who think more of some other country than they do of the United States of America, and all they are thinking about is how to get money out of the Treasury of the United States to send it to some other country.

I say the time has come in the United States of America when the American people should demand of their representatives in the Halls of Congress that they put a stop to the wasteful and extravagant spending of money and the throwing of it away and the dumping of it across the ocean, when the result will be to ruin our own country.

Perhaps I may tell a story I heard the other day about two black-face comedians. One of them said, "You know, I have just been studying my history. You know, I just learned something about George Washington."

The other man said, "What was it?"

"Well," the first one said, "you know who George Washington was; don't you?"

"Why, of course. He was the Father of his Country."

The first man said, "Yes; and he was also the first President."

"That is right," the other one said.

"But," the first one said, "I will tell you something you didn't know." He said, "He took a silver dollar and threw it across the Rappahannock River."

The other fellow said, "Oh, that's nothing. We have got people now who have picked up the whole damn Treasury and thrown it across the Atlantic Ocean." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I intended to vote for the pending measure until it was explained yesterday by the senior Senator

from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. I think he rendered a great service to the Senate and to the people of the country when he explained the measure to the Senate. After listening to his explanation of it, I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that, so far as I am concerned, I owe a duty to the American people to vote against turning over \$1,350,000,000 to an international organization over which we shall have no control and in which we shall have only one vote, although we are asked to contribute more than 60 percent of the funds which will be given to that organization, to be spent as that group, composed of representatives of the various nations who are contributing practically nothing to it, says they shall be spent.

Will we receive any credit for it? Not at all. The people of the United States will not receive the credit for it. In my judgment, when the people of this country come to their senses and realize what is being done, when they realize that we are taking out of the pockets of every man, woman, and child in the United States \$10 to start with, and perhaps much more, we shall find an aroused public opinion in the United States which will condemn every Member of the Senate, which is so recklessly throwing away the money of the American people and spreading it to the four winds.

The American people are extremely sentimental. They are extremely sympathetic. In time of need they have come to the rescue of the people of every other country in the world. But, Mr. President, they have spent that money themselves. They have turned it over to the Red Cross or have given it directly and said, "Here is a gift." Never before in history have they turned money over to a group of nations without having anything to say as to where it is to be spent or how it is to be spent.

I have great respect for Governor Lehman. I think he is a great executive and a fine man. I also have great respect for our representative in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization. But I repeat that in my judgment we are taking a step which will result in every Member of the Senate who votes for it living to see the day when he will regret voting to turn \$1,300,000,000 over to foreign groups to spend as they will without any control by the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the able Senator for his answer to my question. I should like to ask the Senator to answer another question.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall be glad to answer it if I can.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear all the discussion between the able Senator from Montana and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] yesterday afternoon; but as I have studied the joint resolution I have been interested to know what the Senator's view is with respect to the restricted authority granted in article V, subparagraph 1, on page 12. Does the Senator feel that that provision satisfactorily limits the authority granted in article I, subparagraph 1, which reads:

The Administration shall have power to acquire, hold, and convey property, to enter

into contracts and undertake obligations, to designate or create agencies and to review the activities of agencies so created, to manage undertakings and in general to perform any legal acts appropriate to its objects and purposes.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming felt that paragraph 1 of article V on page 12 restricted the amounts which might be appropriated and the contracts which might be entered into under the provisions of article I, subparagraph 1. Does the Senator care to express an opinion on that subject?

Mr. WHEELER. I am sorry I cannot agree with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. I am giving only a curbstone opinion, because I have not looked into the question closely; but I am convinced that under that provision the R. F. C. could lend money to this organization without coming to the Congress. We have given the R. F. C. the broadest kind of power to lend money to organizations of all kinds. I call attention to the fact that Mr. Morgenthau has a stabilization fund of \$2,000,000,000, which he can spend in almost any way he desires. Why it was expressed in this language I do not know; but certainly before any money is spent it ought to be expressly stated in plain language that the Administration must come to the Congress of the United States.

The Senator from Nebraska knows, as do all other Senators who have had dealings with the bureaus and departments of Government, that once we give them power in loose language, they go far beyond the intention expressed by the Congress. That is true not only of this administration but of every administration. It has been true as long as I have been a Member of the Senate. We cannot be too careful about expressly stating our intentions in the simplest language so that there can be no question whatsoever about them.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I asked the question because of the experience we have had in the payment of consumer subsidies. I cannot find anywhere in the statute books the authority for such payments. This administration pays consumer subsidies. I do not believe it has the authority to do so.

Is there any doubt that a constituted authority—whether it be the R. F. C. or some other governmental agency—may be able to circumvent Congress? Should we not make plain our intention? If there is any agency in our Government from which the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization can obtain money to fulfill a contract which it enters into, which exceeds the authorization of \$1,350,000,000, it seems to me that it ought to be made clear that the only constituted authority to which it can go for an additional appropriation for an unfulfilled contract which may require more money than is allocated, is the Congress of the United States. If the administration feels that it is legal to pay consumer subsidies, as it is doing today without authority, will it not exceed the authorization of \$1,350,000,000 if it chooses to do so? I do not see any difference between a United Nations subsidy and a consumer subsidy here at

home. If the organization can go to some agency other than Congress and obtain money which is not appropriated by Congress, we are indirectly granting larger appropriations to the organization than the limitation in article V on page 12.

Mr. WHEELER. I invite attention to a statement which has already been mentioned today by the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. The statement was made by Sir Arthur Salter in a recent speech to the cooperatives. He said:

Whoever relieves will rebuild, and whoever rebuilds will formulate the pattern of government.

This organization of 44 governments or authorities is to do the relieving. Russia will play a dominant part. Great Britain will play an important part, and we shall have 1 vote. If what Sir Arthur Salter says is true, that whoever relieves will formulate the pattern of government, what kind of a pattern of government will be set up in Europe after this war? Who will set up the pattern of government? I cannot believe that any Member of the Senate, under existing conditions and circumstances, can come to any other conclusion than that Russia will dominate Europe after this war is over. Some say that Russia will be so busy rehabilitating her own country that she will not be interested in other governments, and will not need to be interested in them.

With the poverty and misery which will exist in Europe after this war is over, what kind of a government will appeal to the masses of poverty-stricken people? Will they turn to the Government of the United States, or to Great Britain, which has been bombing them? Russia has not been bombing them. Or will they turn to the people who have been successful in resisting the Nazis, a people who believe in communism, which appeals to the masses of the people in their misery? Anyone in his right senses who knows anything about the psychology of the masses of the people of the world under such conditions must realize that Russia will dominate those countries. We shall probably rehabilitate them.

I am in sympathy with efforts to rehabilitate the starving people of stricken countries, whether they are to be dominated by Russia or by some other country, or some other form of government. However, I believe that the proposal before us is a blank check. My Republican friends have been out on the stump. Time and again they have criticized Democrats for giving blank checks to the President of the United States, and yet Republicans rise on the floor of the Senate and say that we ought to give a blank check, not to the President of the United States, but to a foreign group over whom we are to have no control.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have heard the Senator from Montana speak, and I did not intend to interrupt him. Like some bodies which have movement, he gets worse the farther he goes.

Mr. President, this is not a blank check to anybody. It is delimited as to amount, and it is delimited as to authority in as clear-cut language and fashion as we knew how to delimit it.

I do not care to comment especially on the other general remarks of the Senator from Montana. He has said that he is in sympathy with the liberated peoples. However, they cannot eat sympathy. Sympathy smells good, but it is not sustenance; it is not nourishment. The liberated peoples cannot eat sympathy. They cannot wear sympathy.

A little later in this debate I shall point out to Senators who are contending that we have no control over the organization, that I have a solution for that difficulty. The solution which I would suggest is merely to tell the other nations to get out of the way and let us operate the organization. We will furnish all the money and all the officers, and we will have absolute control. That is what we did in the First World War. Later in the debate I shall place in the RECORD facts showing that instead of \$1,350,000,000, which it is now proposed to appropriate, in the First World War we spent \$2,600,000,000, practically all of it out of our own pockets. If Senators would prefer to return to that sort of procedure and not cooperate with other nations, very well.

The value of the cooperation of other nations lies not so much in the amount they contribute as in their interest and obligation wherever they are able to do so, to rehabilitate themselves and provide relief for themselves. One of the cardinal principles of this organization is to urge and stimulate them to do so.

I did not wish to take up the Senator's time, but I could not resist the temptation at this point to express my views.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to refer to what the Senator from Montana said in his concluding remarks with respect to Republicans who are now supposed to be approving blank checks. The remark must have referred to me because I am the only Republican who has risen to discuss this matter. I should like to say to the Senator from Montana that I have spent the last 6 months on the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee in trying to make sure that this will be no blank check. If he will compare the original agreement with the agreement which is now before the Senate he will find the present net result so totally different that he will, I am sure, on reflection, be inclined to say that the Republican Senator to whom he referred had done a pretty good job in seeing to it that this is no blank check. The best proof which I can give the able Senator from Montana that it is not a blank check is the language of Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson himself, which I again repeat in one sentence:

Congress would have complete power at any time to stop its contributions or to lay down the conditions as to their uses.

When I have achieved a concession from the representative of the Depart-

ment of State that his power under this grant is limited as the language which I have quoted indicates, I respectfully submit to my able friend from Montana that it is no blank check which I have recommended.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know anything about the work the Senator from Michigan has done, but I am sure he has worked hard and worked sincerely. Let me say with all due respect to him—and I have a great respect for him and I am personally fond of him—that I still contend that what we are asked to do is to give a blank check to the President of the United States. When the Senator says it is not a blank check, I assert that, while the amount is limited, a blank check is being given to this organization so that it may spend the money anywhere and in any way it may wish to spend it.

Does the Senator from Michigan think for one moment that the statement made by Dean Acheson is binding?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly, I do.

Mr. WHEELER. Bless my soul, I have seen many persons come to Congress from various governmental departments, as have other Senators, and have heard them make statements as to what the policies were. I can cite the Senator to statement after statement made with reference to the policies of nearly every bureau, and we have seen the bureaus do exactly the opposite of what their representatives had told us would be done.

When the question of subsidies came before Congress, and we passed a bill granting subsidies, it was stated that subsidies would be given only for—what? Only for the producer in cases where there had not been sufficient production in this country to take care of the war needs. When I contended that the money would be given to the processors, distinguished Senators stood on the floor of the Senate and said, "Oh, no, not at all; that is not the purpose of it. It is to be used solely to be paid to producers." It was said that the processors and packers would be used as the agents of the Government of the United States, and that the subsidy would be passed on to the producer and the stock grower. I submit that there is not a stock grower in the United States of America who has received the subsidy, but instead it has gone entirely to the processor.

In reference to the F. C. C. legislation and S. E. C. legislation, if the Senator from Michigan will read the record of what the representatives of those organizations stated they would do, and then will recall what they later did, he will agree that such statements were not binding on the organizations. Therefore, I contend that the statement of the representative of the State Department—with all due respect for his honesty and sincerity—is not binding on Congress.

I object to accepting as binding the statement of an individual who comes before one of the committees and agrees that his statement is what counts.

What counts is what is written into the law, and how plainly it is written into it by the use of simple language, so that even the Supreme Court of the United States cannot misconstrue it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will indulge me for just a moment, the Senator from Montana does not need to waste any time in trying to prove to me that we have a slippery administration downtown.

Mr. WHEELER. It is not only true of this administration, but it was also true of the departments in Mr. Hoover's administration; it was also true in Mr. Coolidge's administration, and God knows it was true in Mr. Harding's administration, which was one of the most corrupt administrations the country has ever known.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator's precedents are now running into ancient history, which could be amplified in a bipartisan sense. The exhibits which he has presented here were all connected with the existing practice of the present administration. I could add several other exhibits to sustain and fortify the point which he has made. What I am saying to him is that that is precisely the reason why, so far as I was able to do so, I spent 6 months on the Foreign Relations Committee in trying to tie the language down in such a way that impositions on the congressional appropriating powers would not be possible under this grant.

I respectfully submit to the Senator from Montana that if he will study the entire resolution and the total hearings, and if he will contemplate the language in article V and article VI of the agreement which specifically limits our obligation not to this authorization but to the appropriations which are ultimately specifically to be made by Congress, which can be made under any limitations which Congress wishes to attach to the appropriations, he will agree that there is not even a remote parallel between the blank check he has talked about, which I as cordially condemn as does he, and what is contemplated under the present circumstances, which is not anything like a blank check.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If I have followed the Senator from Michigan correctly, the first agreement which was submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee, or which was called to its attention, was not at all in accord with the ideas of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct; nor with the views of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then a subcommittee was appointed, was it not, to go into the matter and that subcommittee, as I understand, had a great deal to do with the present text of the agreement?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. After the text of the agreement had been worked out, did the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee then assure the President of the United States, who, I understand,

signed the agreement on behalf of the United States, that the agreement was satisfactory to the subcommittee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I cannot speak for the whole subcommittee, but, as one member of the subcommittee, I shall regretfully have to say to the able Senator from Utah that I had no hospitality at the White House for about 10 years; I have not been in contact with the distinguished President of the United States and I can give him no information whatever on that aspect of the affair.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator have any information as to whether or not that information did go to the President through the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have no information whatever on the subject. All I know is that the ultimate agreement was approved by the State Department, which speaks for the executive arm of the Government in relation to this measure, and it was approved by the subcommittee, and it was approved by the full committee by a vote of 16 to 1.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, when I took the floor I did not intend to become a referee, so to speak, between Senators in this debate, but I want to thank them all for their contributions. And now that the senior Senator from Michigan is here I should like to get some information from him.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What does the Senator mean by that? I have been on the floor continuously in this debate.

Mr. WHERRY. I mean the Senator was not here when I questioned the senior Senator from Montana. What I am interested in particularly is the limitation of authority. The able Senator from Michigan, is present on the floor, I suppose, is present as much or more than any other Senator on either side of the aisle; and I should like to have his opinion as to the limitation of authority.

I got from his very forceful presentation yesterday, which I appreciated very much, that in the final analysis the way to control the thing is to limit the appropriations. I agree with him in that respect; but, after all, I think that the incident cited by the senior Senator from Montana is a parallel case, for if we have to resort to control of appropriations, then the administration can run around the Congress of the United States, and can get the money for contracts to which they have pledged their name by coming to the constitutional body, the Congress, for the money. That is my opinion, and in that connection I cite the illustration offered by the senior Senator from Montana, there is no authority on the statute books for the administration to pay a consumer's subsidy, and yet they found some reason for paying it, and they can find it again, if Congress does not choose to give the authority. I am asking whether the senior Senator from Michigan feels that the authority proposed to be granted is restricted by article V, section 12?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am very glad to answer the question of the Senator,

though I thought I had undertaken to make my opinion indubitably clear yesterday afternoon.

In the first place, let me say I recognize no analogy between this situation and the other appropriations to which the Senator has referred and other abuses of power by administrative agencies, because I repeat to the Senator that I think the language used in this agreement is the precise result of that experience in an all-out legislative effort to see to it that that sort of a tragedy shall not occur in respect to this particular administration.

I wish to give the Senator an example to prove that I think the administrative agencies are moving with a degree of good faith in respect to this adventure which I would agree has not been too evident in some of its other actions to which both the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Montana referred. I give the Senator this exhibit: The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was set up probably 4 months ago. It had been in preliminary operation I suppose for 60 or 90 days. During that time there were undoubtedly blank check appropriations particularly in respect to foreign affairs, in the hands of both the President and the State Department, which might very legitimately have been drawn upon to make a preliminary contribution to this instrumentality on the part of the United States. Instead of that, the United States has not contributed one thin dime up to this hour and the State Department has said it to us in direct testimony before the committee that it will not permit one thin dime to be dedicated to this purpose until Congress has passed this joint resolution.

That is a totally different attitude, I submit to the Senator from the administrative attitude against which he appropriately complains and against which the able Senator from Montana complains. I cannot emphasize too strongly that in the 16 years I have been in this body, the greater part of it on the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have never had an experience like the present one in its total sympathetic cooperative attitude on the part of the State Department and what appears to be the whole-hearted purpose to yield itself completely to the congressional intent and will in respect to this entire affair.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the able Senator for his statement.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not contradicting the Senator from Michigan, but that is not sufficient when we are appropriating a billion three hundred and fifty million dollars to an organization over which the United States is to have no control.

The senior Senator from Texas said that while I had great sympathy for the stricken people of various countries of Europe, those people could not live on sympathy, and he wanted to know whether I and some others of us wanted to have the Government of the United

States spend what it spent before—\$2,600,000,000. I say "Yes" to that question. So far as I am concerned and so far, in my judgment, as the people of the United States are concerned, they would rather spend \$2,000,000,000 or \$3,000,000,000 or whatever may be necessary; but they want to know who is going to spend it, where it is going to be spent and how it is to be spent rather than to turn it over to a committee composed of Russia, Great Britain, Haiti, Santo Domingo, Liberia, and almost every other country on the face of the globe. Certainly the American people are generous, certainly they may be called upon to spend \$2,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000; but when we spend it let us spend it in the name of the United States of America. Let us spend it in the name of the people of the United States. Let us enable the people of this country to know when we are appropriating their money that it is going to be spent under the auspices of the people and the representatives of the people of the United States, and not be turned over to an international organization over which we have no control except to the extent of 1 vote out of 44. That is the position I take.

I am not complaining that the amount is \$1,350,000,000, but I say that it is time that the Congress of the United States of America begin to consider how much money will be left in the pockets of the people and how much of our resources will be left for the soldiers when they come back. We had better begin to determine whether or not we are going to reduce the people of this country to a state of poverty similar to that which prevails in Europe, China, and elsewhere in the world. We had better examine to see whether we are representing the best interests of our Government, or are representing the interests of some other government.

I appreciate that many of my colleagues do not agree with my philosophy with reference to this matter, but, so far as I am concerned, I shall not vote to turn over \$1,350,000,000, or much of that sum of money, to a group, to be spent by them, if I am the only Member of the Senate to vote against it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to make a further observation, apologizing to the able Senator from Nebraska for the intrusion on his time.

With much the Senator from Montana says, in its general over-all application, I am in total agreement. In fact, that is the reason why I took 2 hours on the floor of the Senate yesterday in trying to emphasize the fact that I think the limitations upon the grants in this agreement are far more important than the grants themselves.

The Senator says that he prefers that we should spend our own money, under our own administrative responsibility. So do I. But this happens to be tied in squarely with the war effort. It is definitely and specifically and indispensably part of the war effort. It links squarely in behind the Army as it moves on from a liberated territory, and it would be

just as sensible to say that we will not have anything to do with the war itself, except as we can totally run our own Army, and totally disregard essential cooperations with the other armies of the nations of the earth.

I insist that as a peacetime operation—and I said it 50 times yesterday—I would consider it fabulous improvidence if this particular agreement were to stand as a precedent or a model or a pattern for any part of our post-war reconstruction world-wide responsibilities. It is nothing of the sort. It is definitely and specifically a part of the war effort, which cannot be avoided. If U. N. R. R. A. does not do this task, the Army itself will have to stay behind and do it. It must be done in some such partnership fashion, and I have yet to hear of a better way to do it than the one proposed.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me further?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand the Senator's position that it is part of the war effort and just as necessary as carrying on the war. I do not subscribe to that view. I think it is the wrong philosophy, and that it is not borne out by the facts.

Of course, we have to follow up and take care of and feed the people of the liberated territories, but is there any reason why we should turn this money over to 44 different countries, they to have the say as to how it shall be spent? If we are to spend it, let us turn it over to the appropriate agency of the United States and let that agency say whether they will spend it in cooperation with Great Britain, or in cooperation with Russia; but let us not turn it over completely to somebody else to say how the money is to be spent, with the United States having 1 vote out of 44, or whatever the number may be. I do not think that can be justified on the ground that it is carrying on the war. I am just as anxious to see the war carried on to a successful conclusion as is any other Member of this body, notwithstanding the fact that there are many people and many organizations which, because one who believes in the United States, and in protecting our interests, does not agree with this or does not agree with that, want to brand him as something other than an American.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is not implying any such attitude on my part?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course not, not for one moment, but I do say to the Senator, in all sincerity, while I agree with everything he has said regarding helping to feed stricken and starving people as a part of the war effort, it should be done by a Government agency, and we should let that Government agency work in cooperation with Great Britain, or let them work in cooperation with Russia, or with the other nations; but let us not turn the money over to a group of countries, many of which have little or no interest in the matter. Let Great Britain and the United States say how the money is to be spent in eastern

Europe and Italy, and how it is to be spent in Yugoslavia, if we go into that country, how it is to be spent in France, in Belgium, and in Holland. Why turn it over to many other countries, and let them squabble as to how it is to be spent?

I think it is a serious mistake to have such an organization saying how the money of this country is to be spent. It cannot be justified, in my judgment. I would rather spend more money and have it controlled by some agency of this country, and have it cooperate with Great Britain, or cooperate with Russia when it relates to Russian territory, or cooperate with China when it relates to Chinese territory, than let a lot of countries, many of which have not anything in common with Great Britain or with the United States, say where and how the money is to be spent.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to state again that when I asked for the floor I did not intend to make a speech on the joint resolution, but I feel that if I have made no other contribution than to have had the senior Senator from Michigan, the senior Senator from Montana, and the senior Senator from Texas, express their views and observations, I have really done something to throw light on the measure. I once again desire to thank them all for using the time. I had only sought the floor to ask a question about some of the terms and provisions of the joint resolution.

Now that some of these most important matters have been called to my attention, and in view of some of the statements which have been made, I wish to say that certainly I am not one of the Republicans who desire to give this administration, or any other administration, a blank check. I also wish to say that, regardless of how I shall vote upon the pending joint resolution, I want it thoroughly understood that I am willing to go just as far as anyone else in providing relief for the people of the liberated countries, and, in my opinion, all Senators are agreed on that. We want to do our part, and accept our responsibility, and I shall gladly join in any appropriation necessary to effectuate that purpose.

There are, however, one or two things I do not want to see done. The senior Senator from Michigan has convinced me at least of the importance of the provision in the bill limiting the authority. The crux of the joint resolution is the limited authority attempted to be written into it, and I agree with what is proposed in that regard. If we are to approve the measure, we must provide limited authority, we must know the obligations we undertake, and we must know what is to be expected in the event the obligations, or further obligations, may be renewed.

On that account, I asked whether or not the senior Senator from Montana felt that article V, on page 12, limited the authority conferred in article I, on page 2. It seems to me that article I, on page 2, goes much further in intent than the restrictions provided in article V, on page 12. It seems to me that as the joint resolution is written, the organization of 44

nations could enter into contracts, which would not be terminated, which would not be expected to terminate, before the appropriation would become exhausted. Then the only thing the U. N. R. R. A. could do, would be to come back to some constitutional body. To what constitutional body would it come? Would it come to Congress, or to the R. F. C., or some other Government agency, and say, "Here, we spent this money; you gave us the authority, and now we want you to make good on the promise."

Mr. President, I do not want to be challenged later as giving even moral support to a promise we do not expect to fulfill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. By any stretch of the imagination does the Senator think that the R. F. C. could be defined as an "appropriate constitutional" body?

Mr. WHERRY. I will answer that question by asking the senior Senator from Michigan this question: Does he think that the constitutional body has been defined in the measure as the Congress, or as some agency from whom the U. N. R. R. A. can obtain money when it needs it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator cannot get me into any quarrel over charges which he makes against this administration with respect to use of funds which it may obtain contrary to the specific intention of the Congress of the United States. I wish to say again, that is the reason why this thing intrigued me from start to finish, and I tried to find if it was possible to put down in black and white a rule which was binding.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask, What is a constitutional body? A constitutional body is any body which is created under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. The R. F. C. is a constitutional body.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The R. F. C. could not remotely be considered to be a constitutional body under the language in question at the point where it appears in this measure.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is a great lawyer, and he knows—

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Montana must not be sarcastic. One of my virtues is that I am not a lawyer. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, what is a constitutional body? We create various bureaus which are arms of the Congress of the United States, and they are quasi-legislative bodies. I say that under the language in question the R. F. C. can contend that it is a constitutional body. It is a body which is created under the Constitution of the United States. It is not the intention of the Senator from Michigan that it should be so considered, and it is not the intention of many who helped to draft the proposed legislation; there can be no question about that; but why not say in plain simple language, so there can be

no question about it, "the Congress of the United States"?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The reason is very simple and obvious. The language in this agreement applies to all the nations signatory to it. We have to describe the appropriate constitutional body which, under any given form of government, has the constitutional control of appropriations. I do not think the Senator upon reflection would really undertake to certify the opinion that the R. F. C. is a constitutional body in the accepted sense of that phrase.

Mr. WHEELER. No; I agree that it is not in the accepted use of that phrase. The Supreme Court of the United States has differed not only with me but with great constitutional authorities in the country whose reputations as constitutional lawyers go far beyond mine—and I do not claim to be a constitutional authority—as to what is the meaning of the phrase.

The Senator from Tennessee suggested yesterday—and I think his suggestion to be very appropriate—that a provision should be inserted in the measure that, with respect to the United States, those who represent us in the organization cannot come back here and obtain money without the consent of the Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I rose for the purpose of making a suggestion similar to the one just made by the Senator from Montana. This language can easily be changed so as to make absolutely certain what is intended. The Senator from Michigan very strenuously asserts that it was the intention that only the Congress of the United States should have the decision. If that be the case, then I suggest that after the word "bodies", on page 12, line 9, the period be stricken and a comma or a dash inserted, followed by the words "in the case of the United States, the Congress", or "in the case of the United States it means the Congress of the United States."

The reason I make that suggestion is that, as we all know, several years ago, under the Constitution and in a perfectly constitutional way, we gave the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the power to borrow money on the bonds of the United States, and we have since given the President power to use such money for a great many purposes similar to those in question, and I think unquestionably the R. F. C. could be construed to be a constitutional body. The Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] both say that it was intended that the Congress of the United States was the body which should appropriate the money. If that is what is intended, let us remove all doubt, because it is a very important matter, as we all know, and we ought to say exactly what we mean, and mean exactly what we say in this matter. For that reason I have suggested an amendment after the words "constitutional bodies" to add "in the case of the United States the Congress of the United States is meant."

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not care to prolong this metaphysical constitutional argument with respect to the difference between a constitutional body and any other body. This question, however, arises in the United States not only in respect to the Federal Government, but in respect to all the States. Most of the interpretations which have given to that subject with respect to the State constitutions, which are more numerous than the interpretations with respect to the Constitution of the United States, have to do with offices and bodies within the State which have been divided into constitutional and statutory offices and bodies.

As a rule, constitutional offices or bodies have been held to be those which are specifically established in the constitution under which they exist. Other offices created by legislation in the States are regarded to be statutory offices and not constitutional offices, although they are created under power given to the legislatures by the constitution under which they operate. So there is a very clearly drawn distinction between statutory offices and constitutional offices, and I think the same distinction would apply to the R. F. C. or to any office created by Congress as an agency of Congress or the Government, as distinguished from the bodies which are specifically created by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest a further exhibit as identifying the meaning of the language.

Mr. WHERRY. Which language?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The language which is causing the able and vigilant Senator from Tennessee so much trepidation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not trepidation, but actual fear.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Well, I am sometimes impressed by the Senator's fears and sometimes I am not. I am referring to the language on page 12 in line 9, "appropriate constitutional bodies." I respectfully suggest that the first sentence of the joint resolution says:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated—

And so forth—
such sums—

And so forth—
as the Congress may determine from time to time to be appropriate for participation by the United States—

And so forth. Read in connection with that clear and unequivocal statement it seems to me, if I may again use the word "fantastic"—it seems to me to be fantastic to think that anyone would undertake to say that the appropriate constitutional body to make appropriations in the United States or to provide one nickel for this institution, would be any other than the Congress itself.

I simply wish to add, and then I am through for the day, that if I so totally

lacked confidence in this administration that I feared it would distort the words "constitutional bodies" to mean the R. F. C. in order to go behind the barn and cheat the intent of Congress, I certainly would not vote for the joint resolution at all, just as I have never voted for the administration at all. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply wish to say in connection with what the Senator from Michigan has said, that I have every confidence in the present administration. But we are confronted with a question as to the meaning of words. We all here say that what we intend is that the money to be used for the purposes of the joint resolution is to be drawn from the Treasury of the United States after action by the appropriate committees of the Congress and by the Congress itself. If we all mean that, why do we not say precisely what we mean?

I have had the legislative drafting service of the Senate prepare an amendment which contains this language, and I challenge any Senator—it makes no difference who—to rise and say the language I propose will not carry out what it says we mean. Of course, we must do this by way of reservation; we cannot put it in by way of amendment, because it must be agreed to by the other nations. The language is as follows:

SEC. —. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

That in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States.

That is exactly what the Senator from Michigan says his language or the language of the joint resolution as reported intends. If that is what it intends, why not say so?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, just a further word, and then I shall keep the promise I made a moment ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not make such a promise. We like to hear the Senator from Michigan; he is always interesting.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator insists on this identification, which seems total surplage to me, instead of attempting to do it by reservation to the agreement as it is carried in the resolution, that procedure obviously requiring subsequent consent from other governments, inasmuch as it is dealing solely with the domestic question, I suggest that the Senator attach his definition at the end of the joint resolution, so that it will relate to the portion of the joint resolution which refers to the activities of our own Government of the United States. In that way it would be just as effective.

However, I wish to add that I think it is surplage. I think it would be just as sensible to say that wherever the word "President" is used in the joint resolution it means Franklin D. Roosevelt until next January, and then it means someone else.

Mr. McKELLAR. It might not; he might be President after next January. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we hope he will not be. [Laughter.]

I desire to make a concluding statement, and then I shall yield the floor. I wish I felt as confident about the limitations in the joint resolution as the senior Senator from Michigan seems to feel. I cannot feel other than that article I, on page 2, goes a long way toward having this organization enter into obligations which will go far in excess of the appropriation now sought to be authorized, and that then the organization will come back and want additional appropriations. Of course, we add a limitation by requiring that the request for additional appropriations must be brought to the Congress, as the senior Senator from Michigan has so ably and forcibly shown here this afternoon.

But my decision as to whether I shall support the joint resolution will depend upon whether this thing can be buttoned up and sewed up with respect to the limitation of power.

I do not want to provide for this administration or any other administration a loophole which will enable it to exercise powers beyond the powers intended to be granted under the pending measure. I saw now that it seems to me there is a question. Question has been raised all the way through. The fact that the able senior Senator from Michigan stated over and over again that there were limitations, and yesterday charged the Appropriations Committee that they were the only ones to pass on this matter, convinced me that there is some doubt as to whether the pending measure contains sufficient limitation of authority.

I say that for the reason that it is my humble opinion that contained in the agreement is the substance of provisions which should be contained in a treaty. If that be so, a favorable vote by two-thirds of the Senate should be required, instead of a majority vote by both Houses of Congress. For that further reason, I feel we should see to it that the limitations are contained in the joint resolution.

I appreciate the amendments which have been submitted; and I hope other amendments will be submitted, so that we shall have a piece of legislation which will require that Congress, not any other body which might be interpreted as being a constitutional body, shall be the one to pass on the question whether we shall appropriate and continue to appropriate for contracts which will be made, not by the Senate, not by the United States Congress, but by a group of 44 nations joined in an organization in which we shall have only one vote. We will not obtain protection there. We must obtain it in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] gave an exact definition of constitutional and statutory offices and bodies. There should be no confusion at all on that point, because the courts have unanimously, I think, interpreted "con-

stitutional offices" just as the Senator described them—those that are authorized or named in the Constitution itself.

The joint resolution now pending before the Senate is based wholly on the agreement which is found in the document I hold in my hand, entered into at Atlantic City on November 9, 1943. That agreement is the foundation of the joint resolution, and is based upon it.

Mr. President, whatever is contained in the joint resolution obtains its authority from the agreement. I desire to call attention to the fact that the agreement is certainly in treaty form, if not in name. What we are undertaking to do here is to approve, by implication at least, an agreement entered into with some 40 foreign nations, having to do with a continuing subject. It is not a finished subject; it is not an agreement that they shall perform some individual act, and then end. It is a continuing subject for whatever length of time may be necessary.

So, Mr. President, I am greatly concerned about the meaning of this contract, about the method by which it was entered into, and about where it will lead the United States of America. Under our form of government this country can enter into an agreement in the form of a treaty with another nation or other nations only by the act of this body. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has said that this proposal is not a treaty. I do not know. It is certainly a treaty in form, if nothing else.

Chiang Kai-shek, being a dictator over his country, can sign a treaty, agreement, contract, or whatever it may be called, by placing his name on it. Joe Stalin, being a dictator in his own country, can bind his country to a contract, agreement, treaty, or whatever it may be called, by placing his name on it. As to whether or not Winston Churchill can bind Great Britain by placing his name upon an agreement, I do not know; but I do know, without any if's or and's about it, that the President cannot bind his country by placing his name upon a contract or agreement without the approval and consent of this body.

The agreement which I have before me was made weeks ago, without the knowledge or consent of the American people and without the knowledge or consent of this body. It has never been submitted to us for approval or confirmation. It was signed on behalf of this country by the President of the United States.

It is provided in the joint resolution that this agreement, contract, treaty, or whatever it may be called, shall go into effect upon his signature. Therefore, this contract went into effect on the day the President of the United States signed it, without the knowledge or consent of this body and without the knowledge or consent of the American people, and, in my opinion, without any authority to do so. In my opinion, that is one of the most serious things in connection with this joint resolution and the contract or agreement upon which it is based.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to a few of the things which cause me great concern. If it were not

for the very able discussion and explanation of the senior Senator from Michigan yesterday I am quite certain in my own mind that I would vote against the joint resolution. In my opinion, he has shown that the joint resolution is in reality a part of our war effort. If that be so, we are bound to do some things which we would not otherwise do. That is why I have been so concerned about the language of the contract and whether or not the Senator has satisfactorily explained it to us.

Yesterday I asked the Senator from Michigan who is to control the interpretation of this sort of agreement. He said he did not know, but he presumed that the 43 other nations which signed the agreement, contract, or treaty would control, and our one little vote would be pretty ineffectual in deciding the interpretation of the contract.

We shall be up against the same thing that we were up against in connection with the so-called Moscow agreement or pact of a few weeks ago. I was much interested in it. I have never seen the exact terms of it. I do not know what it is, except as it is reported in the newspapers. However, I find news comments to the effect that there are three distinct, separate, and somewhat contradictory interpretations placed upon the Moscow Pact by the three principal countries involved.

If we can believe the press reports with respect to the Moscow Pact, Russia has interpreted it to mean that no central European federation will be tolerated by Russia. Russia interprets it to mean that there will be no artificial union of powers in Russia, and that there will be no buffer states between Russia and the rest of Europe. That is the Russian interpretation of the Moscow Pact.

What does our Secretary of State say about it? His interpretation is in complete disagreement with that of Russia. Secretary Hull says that the Moscow Pact means that there shall be no more alliances, no more spheres of influence, and no balance of power.

How does England interpret the Moscow pact? England interprets it to mean that it is necessary for England to have the balance of power which has been controlling Europe for hundreds of years, in order that England may continue to exist.

Those are the three interpretations of the Moscow Pact by the three principal countries. The interpretations are completely at variance. I use that only as an illustration of what may happen when this agreement goes into effect, if it is not already in effect. There may possibly be 44 different interpretations as to what the contract means; and certainly the United States of America would receive short shrift from its associates if our interests should happen to conflict with those of other nations.

I invite the attention of the Senate to one or two things in the joint resolution. Yesterday the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] called to our attention the powers to be conferred upon the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration,

They are set forth in article I, subparagraph 1, on page 2 of the joint resolution.

The Administration shall have power to acquire, hold, and convey property—

That is a pretty broad grant of power to this Council, made up of representatives of foreign governments. There is no limitation as to where property may be acquired, how it may be acquired, or what amount may be acquired. The Administration is simply given power to acquire property.

The Administration is to have the power to convey property. It may buy and sell property anywhere in the world. Under the provisions of this section it may "enter into contracts and undertake obligations."

What obligations? What contracts may the Administration enter into without our knowledge and consent? We are bound by article I, subparagraph 1, to turn over the operation of the whole program to a council of foreigners.

The Administration is also to have the power—
to designate or create agencies—

We might lend them some of our bureaus, but this Council is to have power to create any number of new ones—and to review the activities of agencies so created, to manage undertakings, and in general to perform any legal act appropriate to its objects and purposes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Having raised the question as to what this organization is, what would the Senator say is the legal effect of the organization? It cannot be a partnership of nations, can it, because nations are unable to be partners? How would the Senator class the organization?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I class the agreement as a treaty, and the organization might be termed a "league of nations" or a "confederation of nations." I believe the point raised by the Senator is fundamental.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator have any information as to how this agreement was approved by other countries? Did they submit it to their respective legislative bodies for approval? Has the Senator any information on that point?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have no information on that point.

Mr. WILLIS. I have seen no statement concerning how the agreement was received and approved in other countries.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. According to the pamphlet issued by the committee, or by the Council of the United Nations at its first session, purportedly the heads of the various nations signed the agreement. That is the only information I have on the subject.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator has no information as to their constitutional authority for signing?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; I have not. I know that it is necessary that the legislative bodies of France and England ap-

prove any agreement entered into by their representatives.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I notice that on page 2 of the joint resolution the Administration, which is the association, takes unto itself the power "to acquire, hold and convey property."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would not such power be determined entirely by the place and location at which this association was attempting to exercise the power?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator restate his question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have stated that on page 2, line 21 of the joint resolution now under consideration, the following language is set forth: "The Administration"—which is the association—"shall have power to acquire, hold and convey property." Would any such act be governed by the laws of the area in which the association or Administration attempted to hold or convey property?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator means that the Council would have no authority unless the laws of the particular nation involved approved the act of the Council.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Perhaps the Senator is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. In the attempt to determine what kind of an association this is, let us consider this question: Because a sovereign nation cannot be sued without its consent, the United States, for instance, certainly could not be sued and could not sue, could it?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. So, when we come to the language which states that the Administration has the right "to enter into contracts and undertake obligations," do we not have to say that these contracts and these obligations must be interpreted by the law of the area in which they are to be entered into? How could this association enter into a binding contract here in the United States? It certainly could not enter into a contract upon which a suit could be based and maintained, could it?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not believe so, unless by this resolution such authority is granted.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I was coming to. By adopting this resolution do we approve and ratify this particular organization?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I think we do. I think it is unquestioned that the minute the Congress gives its O. K. to this resolution it approves the whole U. N. R. A.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do we classify this as being an executive agreement at the time it was entered into, and assume that we are now ratifying that executive agreement, and insofar as the Congress of the United States is authorized to do so, are creating an organization approved by the United States Congress?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It would seem so to me. We are going further than that, if I may be permitted a suggestion. The minute we approve this resolution we

approve the contract which was entered into by the 44 nations, and approve by a vote of this body, a treaty in form.

Mr. FERGUSON. If I may inquire further, when we say that we are approving all contracts, is it not true that we are approving them only insofar as moral obligations are concerned? In other words, this creates no legal obligation, because the United States as a Nation cannot be sued unless it consents to the suit. However, we can create moral obligations in the minds of our people and in the minds of the people of other nations.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. And when we have a moral obligation, and no legal obligation, we are more strongly bound to carry out the moral obligation, to a certain extent, than we are to carry out the strict terms of a legal obligation.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct.

I now return to the point which I started to discuss a moment ago. I refer to section 5 on page 11 of the resolution. The language to which I refer reads as follows:

The Director General shall make periodic reports to the Central Committee and to the Council covering the progress of the Administration's activities.

Yesterday, in connection with the discussion relative to those reports, I raised the point that the Congress of the United States would know nothing about what was going on under this contract except what it gained from the newspapers.

The next sentence of this paragraph reads:

The reports shall be made public except for such portions as the Central Committee may consider it necessary, in the interest of the United Nations, to keep confidential.

By that language we have surrendered every right to know what is taking place on the part of the Council, and what it is doing. Yesterday I asked the distinguished Senator from Michigan if the Congress would be informed and he said, "Oh, yes; the President informs it." I am sorry to differ with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Michigan, but the President does not inform us. Support for that statement is found on page 12 of the joint resolution, article VI, reading as follows:

The Director General shall submit to the Council an annual budget, and from time to time such supplementary budgets as may be required, covering the necessary administrative expenses of the Administration.

To that extent only would the President report to Congress the money he had received, and the money he had paid out. The report would perhaps be in the form of an itemized statement. However, there are no reports provided for in this resolution to be furnished Congress or anyone else concerning what this organization of foreign governments does with our money in carrying out the program of relief, and all the activities implied in the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment at this point, on page 11—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to advise the Senator that

a committee amendment is now pending. The Senator may offer his amendment now only by unanimous consent.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Chair. I wish to state the purpose of the amendment, and then I shall ask unanimous consent to offer it, if I may do so. On page 11, line 11, following the word "Council," I propose to add the following words, "and to the Congress"—just those four words. In other words, I wish to provide that these reports must be made to the Congress as well as to the Council.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator means the Congress of the United States?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes; the Congress of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think we should follow the orderly procedure. The Senator will have an opportunity to offer his amendment, but I do not think the pending committee amendment should be set aside for the purpose of allowing a Senator to offer another amendment now.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Very well. Is there any objection to having the amendment printed so that it may lie on the table?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; the Senator has that right.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator proposes to offer an amendment to the agreement itself, which in turn would have to be ratified by all the other nations.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes; I presume that is true. However, I think it is most essential that the Congress of the United States shall know what takes place under the agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator realizes that as to the language of the agreement itself, if we are to amend it so that Congress shall be notified by the Director General, as well as by the Council of the organization, every other nation signatory to the agreement will have the right then to amend the agreement so as to provide that its legislative body shall also be notified.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I cannot see why that should not be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that event we would have this agreement going back and forth for an interminable length of time before we would really know what it was.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask the Senator from South Dakota especially in what respect will he say that the amendment he would offer on page 11, line 11, would alter the requirement provided in section 2 of the resolution itself and on page 15, lines 1 to 3, which read:

The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures made under any such appropriations and of operations under the agreement.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. There is no requirement, as I read the joint resolution,

for a report on the activities of the Council. The President is to report on expenditures of money and on operations under the funds placed in his hands, but we will know nothing about what is going on and about what the Council may have done. That is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I did not hear the precise amendment offered by the Senator, but I gathered that it was to that portion of the joint resolution which embodies the agreement itself. As the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has said, if we modify the agreement, then it has got to go back to every nation which is a party to it, and if it were not approved by all these nations it would be a nullity, and they would not be bound by the provisions of the agreement. In other words, if we amend the agreement it will have to go back to be ratified again by all who have heretofore approved it, or it will be a nullity as to those who do not assent to the reservation or amendment. I think I am correct in that respect.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Let me say to the Senator that the interest and welfare of the American people are far more important than the welfare or the interest of 43 other nations, and it is our job to try to protect the American people first.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator will permit me, I think everyone agrees with the Senator in the statement he has just made. The only point I had in saying anything was inferentially to suggest that the Senator's amendment might be added at another place, a later place in the joint resolution, and not be added as an amendment to the agreement which is simply recited in the joint resolution.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator, and thank him.

Mr. President, as I stated in the beginning, and now repeat, I do not oppose now nor would I oppose at any time assisting in any manner that we could toward the relief of people who have been stricken in this tragic war. I do not want to be placed in the position of appearing to oppose that objective. I am only calling attention of the Senate to some of the provisions of the joint resolution which are detrimental to our people, but not for the purpose of opposing the resolution itself.

The very point the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] brought about a moment ago was mentioned yesterday by me in a query submitted to the senior Senator from Michigan. My query was:

While we have the legalistic right to do thus and so, as the Senator has so clearly pointed out, is there not a moral obligation to go along with the agreement and fulfill all its terms, regardless of what Congress may decide to do in the future?

To that question the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] replied as follows:

I do not think so; and when I have concluded my schedule of limitations, I think the Senator will agree with me that the situation is fairly clear.

Immediately before that question I asked the Senator from Michigan this question:

Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan a question. If the other forty-odd members of the Council should place a different interpretation upon some decision than our own representative or our Congress places upon it—

Mr. VANDENBERG. It would be just too bad.

That is the point which was brought out by the junior Senator from Michigan. If we enter into this contract, if we approve all the provisions set forth in the joint resolution and in the contract, it will be "just too bad" for us and probably for the world if we do not go along with the proposal.

A Senator said on the floor yesterday that we can withdraw from this organization if we want to at any time and thereby relieve ourselves of the obligation. But, Senators, that is not true. We cannot withdraw from the organization at any time we want. The provisions of the joint resolution itself take care of that, but the moral obligation, stronger by far than the legal part of it, prohibits us from withdrawing. If we enter into commitments and obligations across the water, if we start rehabilitation programs across the water, even though they be mismanaged to our disgust and our anger, and we want to get out of the organization, we cannot get out of it; we are in it to the finish. We are in it not only because of the moral obligation but we are in it because the joint resolution itself says the only way in the world we can get out of the agreement is to serve notice at a time 6 months after the agreement goes into effect, and then we cannot get out for 12 months after we have served such notice. The last provision of the joint resolution says it shall terminate on June 30, 1946, which is a trifle over the 18 months it would take us to get out of the organization. So in my opinion, Senators, the provision with reference to withdrawal and being relieved of the obligations is simply a futile gesture and does not mean a thing in the world.

In another portion the joint resolution provides that before we can get out we must make every payment and perform and finish every commitment we have said we would undertake. So while Senators may talk about withdrawal, there is no such thing as withdrawal. We have got to take the thing as it is, and know we are going through with it, or stay out of it. That is the decision the Senate must make when it finally comes to vote upon the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I am wondering in what position we are with regard to the resolutions which might be considered to be in the form of amendments, some 34 of them, which are included in the report of the organization. Some of them go pretty far; some of them really commit us to do things which, in my judgment, do not appear in the joint resolution itself. If the Council can change the picture by subsequent resolution or

amendment, or whatever it may be called, what is to prohibit the Council, loaded against us as it is at the start, from changing the agreement and the resolution to suit themselves?

Senators, I think this matter is so serious that we should give it plenty of time before acting upon it, not with the idea of opposing proper proposal along this line but with the idea and hope of protecting the interests of this country and preventing the waste of our substance.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 205. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons who have claims for damages or losses allegedly resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Jacksonville, Fla., and for other purposes;
H. R. 213. An act for the relief of Edward H. Smith;
H. R. 399. An act for the relief of John Sims;
H. R. 547. An act for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham;
H. R. 550. An act for the relief of Mrs. Renzie Graham.
H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Pacific Dry Dock & Repair Co., Inc.;
H. R. 850. An act for the relief of George M. Louie;
H. R. 1311. An act for the relief of Dan Crofts;
H. R. 1388. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes;
H. R. 1442. An act for the relief of Lafayette Gibson;
H. R. 1467. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal;
H. R. 1854. An act for the relief of Ethel Cohen;
H. R. 1872. An act for the relief of J. E. McCoy & Son;
H. R. 1934. An act for the relief of Mrs. Donald B. Johnston;
H. R. 2075. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper;
H. R. 2199. An act to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended;
H. R. 2340. For the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.;
H. R. 2580. An act to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of South Dakota and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin, to make provisions concerning the ex-

ercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote the most efficient use of those waters, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2639. An act for the relief of William M. Tucker and Nelda M. Tucker;

H. R. 2690. An act for the relief of Oswald L. Sawyer;

H. R. 2691. An act for the relief of Tom S. Steed;

H. R. 2804. An act for the relief of Ruth E. P. Phillips, as executrix of the estate of Amos Russell Phillips, deceased;

H. R. 2924. An act to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands; and for other purposes;

H. R. 2976. An act to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps;

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James T. Rogers;

H. R. 3076. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 3153. An act for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased;

H. R. 3189. An act for the relief of Thomas Lewis;

H. R. 3329. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse;

H. R. 3332. An act for the relief of Spencer Meeks;

H. R. 3428. An act to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442);

H. R. 3477. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Wade Bros., a partnership composed of M. J. G. W., and Ovid Wade;

H. R. 3605. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively;

H. R. 3606. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the outlying degaussing branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942;

H. R. 3607. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in tent L-76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943;

H. R. 3760. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps; and

H. R. 3916. An act to permit the construction and use of certain pipe lines for pneumatic tube transmission in the District of Columbia.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words on the joint resolution. The questions which I asked the able Senator from South Da-

kota might indicate that I was against the joint resolution. That is not the case. I believe that we should try to make up our minds as a Congress to determine whether or not we want to appropriate the sum of \$1,350,000,000 for relief and rehabilitation. I have come to the conclusion that that should be done by the Congress of the United States. I realize that this is an unusual piece of legislation. It is in effect an approval of an Executive agreement by the President of the United States which he entered into last November. It is unusual in that, by adopting a joint resolution to authorize the appropriation of money, we are asked—and I believe the Senate will do it—to approve that Executive agreement.

There is no doubt in my mind that the joint resolution does not authorize the R. F. C. or any other statutory body to finance this association of nations. I think the able Senator from Kentucky gave a proper definition of a constitutional body. I should like to add that I think the distinction between a constitutional body and a statutory body is that the Congress has the power and the authority to abolish or to alter in any way a statutory body, whereas it has no authority to abolish a constitutional body.

The constitutional body referred to, I am satisfied, because of the wording in the agreement, is the Congress of the United States. The R. F. C. does not appropriate money. "Appropriate" is not a proper term when applied to what the R. F. C. does. It may lend money, it may advance money, but it does not appropriate money. The word "appropriate" as used in the joint resolution clearly refers to an appropriation by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I am of the opinion that when, by the joint resolution, we enter into this agreement, we should carry out every letter and every word of it, and that we should be prepared in the future not to expect to look too closely into what the money has been used for, because when we ratify the agreement, we are giving authority to the governments of the United Nations to go into the war areas and, approving their discretion and their judgment, to the best of their ability, to grant relief and bring about rehabilitation as they may see fit, so far as this Government is concerned, to the amount mentioned in the first part of the joint resolution, on line 4, which is \$1,350,000,000.

Mr. President, I for one am willing to go along with the proposal. I do not believe this should ever be considered as a precedent indicating that the Senate of the United States is relinquishing its right to approve so-called Executive agreements, or is relinquishing its right in the future to approve treaties, and it should be clearly understood that by approving this agreement, we are not giving away or altering in any way the Constitution of the United States or our constitutional authority to approve treaties as treaties, and that we have the right to approve Executive agreements if we are called upon later to appropriate money.

We are not by this act determining what is an Executive agreement and what is a treaty. We are ratifying the proposed agreement as an Executive agreement, and we are authorizing an appropriation of a certain sum to carry it out.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask consent at this time to offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read, and I shall ask then to have it printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend article X, on page 15, by the insertion of the following:

Sec. 5. None of the funds appropriated in pursuance of this authorization shall be expended in the promotion of any educational, religious, or political program in any country in which rehabilitation is carried on.

In the first line on page 11, it is proposed that "Sec. 3" shall be changed to "section 6."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the joint resolution, but with a good many reservations and doubts, and I should like therefore to explain why I intend to vote for it.

Yesterday I asked the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] as to the nature of this particular proceeding, and it was suggested that this is something new, that it is an Executive agreement to be approved by a majority of both Houses of Congress. That is something different from what we have understood as an Executive agreement, and something different from a treaty.

What concerns me about the proposal is that if the Executive can enter into an agreement and say, "I make this agreement subject to the approval of the Congress," and thereby relieve himself of the obligation of making a treaty and submitting it to the Senate for approval by a two-thirds vote, we are establishing a precedent which would be very dangerous indeed. If by Executive agreement there can be set up an international food relief organization, and it can be removed from the treaty field simply by saying it shall be subject to approval of the Congress, then exactly the same thing could be done in the case of a league of nations; a league of nations could be established subject to the approval of the Congress, and at once we would lose entirely the power to carry out the treaty-making process provided in the Constitution. I do not think this Executive agreement can be validated simply because it is subject to congressional approval.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Without expressing approval of or dissent from the philosophy of the Senator from Ohio, he is aware, is he not, that the last World War was finally terminated by the United States not by the ratification of a treaty, but by the adoption of a joint resolution, in which we endeavored to claim all the benefits and privileges of the Versailles Treaty without assuming any of its obli-

gations? That was a departure, too, from constitutional procedure.

Mr. TAFT. What the Senator states is that we did not assume any obligations, and the whole question about a treaty is whether we assume obligations, so that I do not think there is any precedent in that respect. We may have ended the war by joint resolution, we may have recognized the settlements made, but so long as we did not assume any obligations, it cannot be said that under the Constitution we should necessarily have to act by treaty.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as the process which the Senator is discussing is concerned if we can by joint resolution accept the benefits of a treaty to which we are not a party without violating our procedure, or the proprieties, is there any difference between that and undertaking obligations which might ensue under the same sort of procedure?

Mr. TAFT. I think so, yes. If we can get any benefit, I do not suppose we care whether we ratify the instrument or not. The question is, can the Executive, without two-thirds of the Senate, assume obligations? That is the substantial question. I do not think we did get any benefit, that is, to the extent of getting any benefits of promises from any nation to do anything. In effect, we attempted to recognize the settlements made, the boundaries fixed, in the Versailles Treaty, but, so far as I know, we never received any benefits from it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In line with the argument the Senator has been making, and in spite of the fact that he says he intends to vote for the joint resolution, I should like to ask him whether, if such a joint resolution as this were enacted, and once we set such a precedent—and despite the fact that the Senator from Michigan so ably argued yesterday that we were not setting a precedent, it seems to me inescapable that we are—he believes it is likely that at anytime in the future any treaty will ever be presented to the Senate under the constitutional process as provided by the Constitution itself? It seems to me this is a far-reaching departure, which is a congressional recognition of the principle of Executive agreements to be approved by Congress, rather than treaties to be approved in accordance with the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds majority.

Mr. TAFT. That is the difficulty I have been trying to get over, but I do not think it is a precedent, if the Senator wants to know my view.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have been trying to get over it, too, and I find myself unable to get over it in any logical way I have heard discussed. I listened to the very persuasive speech of the Senator from Michigan yesterday, hoping that I could be convinced by it, but unfortunately I find myself in the position of regarding this as a bypass-

ing of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is, however, without any doubt, an authority in the President to do certain things by Executive agreement. Where the line is between what can be done by Executive agreement and what can be done by treaty is uncertain, but I hope at least to suggest where that line is. My conclusion is that this is properly an Executive agreement; not an Executive agreement because approved by Congress, but valid before approved by Congress. In fact, the resolution says so in so many words on its first page:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated * * * such sums * * * as the Congress may determine from time to time to be appropriate for participation by the United States * * * in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, established by an agreement concluded by the United Nations and associated governments on November 9, 1943.

So the validity of this agreement in no way depends on the action of Congress. Congress is asked to appropriate money to support it, and the agreement itself makes it clear that we are free to do so or not, as we choose. But the agreement is a valid agreement. The organization has been established. Governor Lehman has been appointed Director General. The whole thing is set up. This is not an Executive agreement approved by Congress. This is an Executive agreement. Its validity stands or falls on the question whether it is an Executive agreement or a treaty by the United States. If it is a treaty it should be submitted to the Senate for ratification by two-thirds vote. If it is an executive agreement it does not have to be submitted to Congress at all, except as Congress may be asked, and as it may be necessary, to provide money.

Executive agreements may be made, and if they are in the proper field of Executive agreements, they stand or fall on the basis of their own nature. But of course if money is necessary to be appropriated in connection with them, Congress must be asked for the money. That is the situation as I see it now. We do, by appropriating money, indicate that we approve of the agreement, but such approval is not essential to the validity of the agreement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has the Constitution before him on his desk. I wonder if he would be good enough to point out the provision of the Constitution which authorizes an Executive agreement.

Mr. TAFT. I think there is a provision which would apply in the general power to conduct foreign relations. The Senator will find many Supreme Court opinions dealing with the right of the President to make Executive agreements. I wish I could say that the Senator is correct, that we could not enter into any obligation with a foreign nation without making a treaty, but that is not a fact. It is not supported by precedent. Precedent after precedent has supported the

right of the President in certain fields to make Executive agreements. The important thing for us is to determine what those fields are, and to see that the Executive agreements are held to the fields where there is a proper scope for the making of Executive agreements.

A year or two ago I cited to the Senate a book written, as I recall, by Mr. McClure, who was in the State Department, in which he maintained that anything could be done by Executive agreement. If that is so, the function of the Senate in foreign relations has come to an end.

I do not think that extreme position is tenable, but it is taken by some persons. I am afraid, however, that once this resolution is adopted it will be said, as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] suggested, that if this is a new thing, and if it is based simply on the principle that anything can be done by Executive agreement if it is submitted to congressional approval, undoubtedly it will be used as a precedent for every other negotiation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me, I will say that I am very familiar with the book to which he referred, which was cited not only by the Senator from Ohio on the floor, but cited at great length before the Finance Committee by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

What I dread about the joint resolution is that no matter what excuses may be made for it, it comes here in the precise form of the suggestion made by a responsible official of the State Department, evidently put out more or less by authority, although signed by his own name, that in the future it is entirely constitutional and possible to bypass all submissions of treaties to the Senate, and to proceed in this very way, according to the very model presented in the pending joint resolution, without ratification by the Senate according to the provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before the Senator answers the statement made by the Senator from Missouri I wish to call attention to certain words of the Constitution.

He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Now here is a treaty, and it is certainly a treaty, because it is an agreement with 43 other nations or subnations. Forty-three of them agree with us.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. All financed by lend-lease.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know whether they are all financed by lend-lease; but here is an agreement, as we know, with foreign countries, submitted to the Congress and not to the Senate. A treaty is an agreement between foreign nations, as we all know. Here is a proposed agreement with 43 other nations. It is just as plain as the nose on a man's face; there cannot be any mistake about it. Under those circum-

stances, since the Senator is not able to put his finger on any provisions providing for Executive agreements with foreign nations, except the provision I have read in the Constitution, I am sure there cannot be any doubt about its being a treaty.

Mr. TAFT. I wish the Senator from Tennessee were correct. I mean I wish that were the law. But it is not the law. Supreme Court opinion after Supreme Court opinion has held that under the general provision that the Executive power shall be vested in the President of the United States, and possibly in connection with his power to appoint ambassadors and other public ministers and consuls, the President of the United States has certain power to enter into Executive agreements with foreign nations. I cannot cite to the Senator the cases which have so held, but there have been many of them. I should like to agree with the Senator. I wish it could not be done. But, unfortunately, I am afraid it can.

I might ask the Senator from Tennessee, did he himself vote for the trade agreements?

Mr. McKELLAR. Which agreements?

Mr. TAFT. For the Trade Agreements Act?

Mr. McKELLAR. Congress passed an act dealing with trade agreements.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. That measure was passed within the constitutional limitation. The President signed it in the usual way. I have no doubt that we could make an agreement of that sort. But that is something that dealt with trade. The Constitution gives us power over interstate and foreign commerce, and we simply exercised that power. It is a specific power contained in the body of the Constitution, which anyone can see. But there is not a word in the Constitution with respect to Executive agreements.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before we go further I should like to run over the classes of Executive agreements as I have analyzed them, and I must admit that my study is not complete and that I may not be entirely correct.

In the first place, there is no doubt that minor matters may be dealt with by Executive agreement, and the most usually cited instances of minor matters are postal agreements as to the transmission of mail, the honoring of the stamps of other countries, and extradition treaties—so-called treaties, but which actually in most cases have been made by the President without submission to the Congress.

I think it is generally true that all minor matters, or matters which do not assume any substantial obligation with foreign nations, may be handled by the President by Executive agreement.

In the second place, in the field of minor matters the Senate not long ago approved the so-called Panama agreement. It was not really a minor matter. That agreement was approved by a majority of both the House and the Senate. I have no doubt the Senator from Ten-

nessee voted for it. I think I voted against it on the ground that it was an amendment to a treaty, and so it seemed clear to me that even though it were minor it ought to be done by a treaty. But my impression is that the Senator from Tennessee voted for it. If it was valid, it was valid on the ground that it was a relatively minor matter, a matter of business negotiation which was not particularly important.

Where the line is to be drawn between minor matters and important matters, I cannot say; but I think we can insist on having classified as major matters certain things which definitely are not minor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Does he consider an authorization of an appropriation of \$1,350,000,000 a minor matter? I consider it a major matter.

Mr. TAFT. I agree, but there is another reason why I think the pending matter can be handled by Executive agreement.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Speaking of Executive agreements, I find by reading the list of signatories to the agreement the President signed for us, without our knowledge or consent, that 13 of the signatories to the agreement signed it with reservations requiring approval by their own legislative bodies.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, undoubtedly the trade agreements can be justified only on the ground that they can be handled by Executive agreements; because if it were merely a matter of domestic law, such an agreement could be changed the moment it was made; whereas, under the trade agreements procedure, when an Executive agreement is made, without action being taken by either House of Congress, to bind the United States for 3 years not to change its tariffs, that is something which Congress by itself could not do. It could only be done, I think, under the treaty-making power; and I voted against the agreements on that ground. But the agreements were voted for by a majority of the Congress on the theory that such matters could be handled by Executive agreement. I suppose it might be said that 3 years is a very short time, and that if at the end of 3 years a change could be made, the matter would not be so important that it could not fall within the rule applying to minor matters which can be dealt with by Executive agreement.

There are also matters which are clearly matters of domestic policy which can be handled by action of a majority of both Houses. If, for instance, we desire to authorize a policy of lending money to foreign countries, I think that is a domestic matter, although it may be carried through by agreements with foreign nations, and although, when authorized, we obligate ourselves to make those payments. But, obviously, I think it could be established by congressional authority, and then Congress would have to appropriate the necessary money.

In any case, any of these minor matters may have to be submitted to Congress, because one thing which is true of an Executive agreement is not true of treaties, and that is that an Executive agreement cannot modify an existing statute. An existing statute may prevail over an Executive agreement. I am inclined to think that an Executive agreement can be changed by statute if it attempts to deal with domestic law. But that question, at least, has not been settled.

There is another type of Executive agreement which I think can be made, and that is an Executive agreement by which the President binds himself with respect to his policy for the balance of his term, in reference to matters within his power. That is the only justification for some Executive agreements. We entered into an Executive agreement with the other United Nations that we would not make peace with Germany without their approval. The agreement was not submitted to Congress. Congress is the only body which can make peace. I do not think the agreement is binding on Congress. I suppose that so long as the President continues in office he can bind himself not to make peace; and he is the only man who can initiate a treaty of peace.

So, I assume that the United Nations agreement may be good for the remainder of the President's term, but that after his term is over it will no longer be binding on the United States. Thus, Mr. President, I think the President can undoubtedly by Executive agreement bind himself for the remainder of his term to pursue some policy.

It seems to me that justification for the U. N. R. R. A. agreement can be sought in only one way, and that is that it is a part of the war effort. Undoubtedly during the war the President may combine our armies. He is now authorizing the American armies to serve under foreign commanders.

The pending measure is strictly limited to 2 years. If it runs beyond the actual end of the war it will still be a part of the war, as I see it; and I am inclined to believe that by Executive action during the war the President is going to have to enter into a whole series of agreements with foreign nations, that will not affect post-war policies. That, to my mind, is the nature of this particular agreement.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was going to suggest—I sought to secure the Senator's attention a few moments ago on that particular point—that we assume the following situation: As Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, during a state of war, what is there to prevent the President in the exercise of his powers in that function to call together representatives of the other United Nations, and to say to them, "We are going to have to provide some relief so long as the war continues. Acting as President of the United States, I will hand over to you

some money, and set up this fund, if I can get the money from the Congress."

Is not that about what the pending measure would mean?

Mr. TAFT. That is about it; yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. And what is there to prevent him from meeting with the other chiefs and saying to them, "I will do this if I can get the money from Congress"?

Mr. TAFT. I think that would be the case. I think there may be many other agreements. If they are confined to the operations in the war effort, I think they may come under the general power of the Executive to enter into agreements. Of course, if they require money, the agreements would have to be approved by Congress, if money for use under the agreements were desired.

But, apart from that, I believe the pending measure is a war measure. If we do not provide for relief, the Army can do it. Armies are obligated to see that everything possible be done to feed the people of occupied areas into which they go. Under lend-lease we have already authorized the making with other nations of agreements which may provide exactly the same relief, except perhaps not in enemy countries. The making of lend-lease agreements is clearly an Executive function authorized by Congress, and the money is provided by Congress; but an executive agreement is not a treaty. The agreements that have been signed with foreign nations are executive agreements, and their validity depends upon the statutes passed by a majority of the Members of Congress. Executive agreements are not treaties.

Mr. President, what I think is not an Executive agreement is the proposal for a United and Associated Nations stabilization fund. That was submitted by Secretary Morgenthau to the members of the Banking and Currency Committee and the Finance Committee. On July 28 he submitted it again. It has been revised. It is in the form of an agreement. But Secretary Morgenthau himself said:

The international stabilization fund of the United and Associated Nations is proposed as a permanent institution for international monetary cooperation.

It seems to me that is of such outstanding importance, it is of such permanent policy, that I cannot see how we can enter into an agreement with England and other countries to set up a joint stabilization fund to which large sums of money must be contributed, unless we are willing to do so by treaty.

The distinction which I see is that the pending joint resolution is limited to 2 years during a war, as a part of war operations, whereas the international stabilization fund would be a permanent plan for the welfare of the world.

We have an even more extreme case, I think, in the agreement submitted by Secretary Morgenthau as the preliminary draft outline of a proposal for a United Nations bank for reconstruction and development. That fund is also to be a permanent fund. It grows out of the war, but has no relation to the war. I cannot see how we can enter into an agreement with the other nations to put

up a certain amount of money unless the matter is submitted to the United States Senate in the form of a treaty.

Obviously a final agreement to enter into an international organization for the maintenance of peace, with the obligation to use our armed forces to enforce the peace, as is contemplated in the Connally resolution, must be by treaty.

I do not feel entirely confident of my position, but there is no doubt in my mind that Executive agreements can be made, and I believe that cooperation between nations at war together justifies this thing being done as an Executive agreement. It is not the fact that this must be submitted to Congress. It is the fact that this thing itself is part of the actual operation of the war.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Constitution does recognize the difference between a treaty and an agreement. The first subsection of section 10 of article I relates to treaties. It provides as follows:

No State shall enter into any treaty—

And so forth. That is an absolute prohibition. But in subsection 3 there is a qualified prohibition relating to agreements, namely:

No State shall, without the consent of Congress, * * * enter into any agreement—

And so forth. I do not care to discuss it, but I think there is an express recognition of the difference in quality between agreements and treaties.

Mr. TAFT. Whatever may be in the Constitution, by the construction of the courts today there is no doubt of the Executive power to make agreements. The only important thing is to define what falls within the field of Executive agreements, and what falls within the field of treaties.

The important thing, from my standpoint, is that it cannot be made an Executive agreement simply because it may be said that it must have the approval of Congress, and that anything can be put into an Executive agreement if we reserve the right of Congress to ratify it. If we do that we end forever the whole power of the Senate to pass upon agreements, treaties, or obligations with foreign nations. I am voting for this proposal solely on the ground that it is a part of the war effort, and something in which the President can properly engage.

Mr. President, as to the question of policy I have also had some reservations. I do not question the importance of undertaking relief. I served in the American Relief Administration immediately after the end of the last war. I saw perhaps \$2,000,000,000 distributed during a year or more for the relief of foreign nations. I think we never received better value for our money. I think it created more good will than it was possible to dissipate by some of the things we did afterward.

I feel very confident that the proposed relief is a part of our whole war effort. So long as we are involved in the war, it

seems to me that we must carry through the obligation and see that the war is conducted with as little harm as possible, particularly to the people who are fighting on our side. I believe that kindness and liberality of treatment are what distinguish us from the Germans and the Japanese so far as occupied territories are concerned. Certainly I do not wish to follow a policy which would subject us to an unfavorable comparison, in many cases, with what the Germans and Japanese have done. They have done much to condemn them, but there have been instances of their having done exactly what is proposed here.

I am opposed to financing our future trade by loans to foreign countries, but the prevention of starvation is another matter. Although I do not believe that the joint resolution goes so far as to provide assistance in the restoration of property, I should be willing to contribute machinery or whatever may be necessary to get the economic machine going again in those countries, provided it comes from this country. I should vote against the joint resolution with the greatest regret. I think it embraces a policy which we should approve. I am sure that if we were to reject the joint resolution, it would be construed as a disapproval of that policy.

I do not believe that an international organization can be an efficient distributor of relief. If I had to initiate the program, I would propose an international council, in which everyone could speak up, whose members would constantly confer, but who would leave the actual administration of the relief to the particular country which was prepared to put up the money for the relief. I think such an organization would be more efficient. That was what we did after the last World War. I believe that in that instance we did a very efficient job. It was done promptly. Even before the armistice came, we provided for the accumulation of great stocks of supplies. We put ships in motion the moment the armistice came. We were able to negotiate with every other country. We had some difficulty with the blockade, because the British would not lift it immediately; but I am perfectly certain that if that had been an international organization it would have been 6 months before anything could actually have been done. Perhaps we have more time to plan now; but up to this time the Army has been doing the work, largely because the other organization has not been able to get started, or to find sufficient funds.

I believe that an organization which has six masters, and cannot do anything that will offend a particular nation, is likely to be a slow and rather unsatisfactory organization. On the other hand, the Administration has the initiation of foreign policy. It has chosen this method. I may be mistaken. Perhaps the organization in this case can be made as efficient as individual administration.

I believe that if we are to provide food, and are to be generous, we ought to have full credit. I doubt very much if, in the intricacies of an international organization, with employees from every

nation in the world, there will be such credit. After the world war we had a small organization from the food administration. The whole distribution was made by the United States Food Administration. The organization was officered by Americans. When the war ended we must have taken 500 men out of the Army who wanted to stay a while longer. They went into every country in Europe. They were fine, upstanding men. They made a favorable impression for the whole American people. The people to whom relief was being administered appreciated what they were doing. All the way from Armenia to Rumania, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Finland, American supplies were distributed largely under the American flag. I think that was a more satisfactory method than that which is here proposed.

I somewhat question the wisdom of having a council of four deciding how and where the distribution shall be made, when, as a matter of fact, only one of the four will really provide any of the relief supplies. Great Britain will make a contribution, but obviously England has no food or other resources. The British contribution will come very largely from Canada and Australia. The Canadians have been most generous. For example, in the Greek relief, they have been more generous than has the United States. They have been more concerned with feeding children in occupied countries than we have. Certainly the Canadians should participate. I do not see why the relief should not be distributed by a council made up of those who are to supply the relief.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Under the proposal now pending, it will be possible for relief to be given to India, will it not?

Mr. TAFT. With the consent of the British, yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Why is the consent of the British necessary? Is that simply because they have jurisdiction over the territory? Section 4 of the joint resolution is the one which provides for assistance.

Mr. TAFT. Section 4 provides as follows:

In expressing its approval of this joint resolution, it is the recommendation of Congress that insofar as funds and facilities permit, any area important to the military operations of the United Nations which is stricken by famine or disease may be included in the benefits to be made available through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

In another section there is an agreement that relief may not be carried on in the territory of any member government without the consent of the member government, if I correctly remember.

Mr. BREWSTER. What troubles me in that connection is the very great evidence of want which we saw in India. Thousands were starving. Apparently the situation is still continuing. That is a primary responsibility, I assume, of the British Commonwealth of Nations. The thing which greatly impressed me

was that much of what Canada or Australia would be able to do would, under the ordinary laws of humanity, go first to those for whom they are primarily responsible. It seemed to me as I saw many of the 350,000,000 Indians that it would be a very great drain on the resources of any nation which undertook adequately to supply their needs.

Mr. TAFT. I believe the House of Representatives wanted to make clear that there was nothing in the agreement which would prevent distribution of relief to India. I do not think there was.

Mr. BREWSTER. India has not been an occupied nation. There has been practically no encroachment on the territory of India; has there?

Mr. TAFT. That may be true.

The provision to which I have referred was in article VII, reading in part as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision herein contained, while hostilities or other military necessities exist in any area, the Administration and its Director General shall not undertake activities therein without the consent of the military command of that area and unless subject to such control as the command may find necessary.

That language would certainly limit the distribution of relief in India.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator mean that the Indians would come under the definition of "military necessities" existing in the area? The hostilities have encroached very little on the territory of India. They have been chiefly in Burma, I believe. But India might well come under the language "military necessities."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 3, beginning in line 5, may be found the answer to the Senator's question. The language reads in part as follows:

To plan, coordinate, administer, or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations through the provision of food—

And so forth. If the people of India can be considered as victims of the war—and I believe the starvation there is attributed to the war in that area—

Mr. BREWSTER. It has been caused largely by the cutting off of the rice supply by the Japanese occupation of Burma.

I think this matter has arisen under the language found near the beginning of the agreement, which has so often been referred to:

that immediately upon the liberation of any area by the armed forces of the United Nations or as a consequence of retreat of the enemy—

And so forth. I think that is the basis on which it is usually thought of as being designed for the relief of occupied territory.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. In just a moment. My impression is that under paragraph 2 (a) of article I, reading in part, that—

Subject to the provisions of article VII, the purposes and functions of the Adminis-

tration shall be as follows: (a) To plan, coordinate, administer, or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations—

India would be covered, even if the other clause had not been included.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, if occupation is the test, the British have been in hostile occupation of India for nearly 200 years.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate. There is this to be said in favor of a joint organization, and that is that I think we do want today to emphasize our desire to cooperate with the other United Nations as closely as possible. Probably it is very important today that we make it clear that we are prepared to engage in that cooperation, because some of the other allies seem to be forgetting the fact that cooperation is also necessary on their part. However, I do not believe that such a policy can be said to be definite enough to justify any change in our policy. It can be said for this method that it emphasizes tremendously our desire to cooperate just as closely as possible with the other United Nations. Therefore, I shall vote for the joint resolution, although I do not like the method provided for in it, and I have some doubts about that. I have indicated the fear, at least, that it will be used as a precedent for other things for which I do not think it can properly be used as a precedent. However, since the administration has chosen this method of achieving an object which I think is all-important in the war effort, I propose to vote for the joint resolution.

PHOENIX-TEMPE STONE CO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 375) for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co., which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "\$1,500" and insert "\$1,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 16, which will be stated.

The amendment of the committee was, on page 16, line 2, to strike out "at the conclusion of 2 years following the termination of hostilities on all fronts unless specifically extended by an act of Congress" and insert "on June 30, 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

That the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall not be authorized to enter into contracts or undertake or incur obligations beyond the limits of appropriations made therefor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Texas will accept the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I assume the Senator, by the language contained in the amendment, does not mean to limit the expenditures by the entire organization to the amount we would appropriate; does he?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. CONNALLY. What the Senator means is that he does not want the organization to assume any obligation—

Mr. McKELLAR. Any obligation beyond that of the appropriations which would be made by the Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. As to the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no serious objection to the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator whether his amendment would be a reservation, or an amendment to the text of the agreement?

Mr. McKELLAR. It has been stated by the chairman of the committee, and I believe generally acquiesced in by most Senators on both sides of the aisle, that the amendment should appear as a separate section on page 15. That will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would have to be in that form, because it could not be an amendment to the agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment which I offer, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

That in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Texas will accept the amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator agree to have included in his amendment, in line 4, after the word "character", the words "and time"? The language would then read:

That in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character and time of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to the modification.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection I may add that the time of the contribution will be determined by the act of Congress appropriating the money for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it will; but I have no objection.

Mr. WHITE. What the Senator from Kentucky has said probably is true, but I think it would avoid controversy if those words were inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee adopt the modification suggested by the Senator from Maine?

Mr. McKELLAR. I adopt it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator's amendment is somewhat didactic. It solemnly states what everyone knows, or should know—that in the case of the United States the constitutional body of the United States when it comes to appropriations is the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will accept the amendment, I will plead guilty to the charge.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not care to argue with the Senator from Tennessee about fine distinctions as to language, because of course the Senator is much more familiar with distinctions in the use of language; he has been in the Senate so much longer than I have.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to caution the Senator from Texas against making suggestions to the Senator from Tennessee along that line.

Mr. CONNALLY. I realize that the admonition the Senator from Kentucky gives me arises from an experience he had regarding raiment, during a colloquy with the Senator from Tennessee.

I shall not endanger my own safety in that respect, though I see no objection to saying that A is A and B is B.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator, and I hope that the Senate will adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Tennessee adopted the suggestion of the Senator from Maine and modified his amendment accordingly?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer another amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I think the Senator has had his quota. He has had two amendments added to the joint resolution. Has he still another one?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I offer another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

That the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall not be authorized to enter into contracts or undertake or incur obligations beyond the limits of appropriations made therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have one more amendment, and then I shall yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 21, after the word "area", it is proposed to insert "(except areas within enemy territory)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I would not be in favor of that amendment. I do not know what the circumstances are, but there may be place within enemy territory where we would want to furnish relief, for instance, Formosa. That island certainly is within enemy territory. I have no great objection to furnishing some relief to enemy countries. I think we are obligated when we invade them to afford relief if they are without other means of support.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment, and I trust the Senator from Tennessee will not insist upon it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall have to do so. Under the joint resolution as now written relief and rehabilitation may be furnished to any enemy country. The members of the committee, as I understood, said that it was intended by the provisions of section 4 to include India only, and that it was not intended to include Germany, Austria, France, Belgium, and various other nations of the earth.

Mr. TAFT. What about Sicily and Italy? Are they not enemy countries? They have been enemy countries, and portions of them maintain they still are. Certainly the definition is a very doubtful one.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure the Senator from Ohio would not want, and I do not believe any other Senators would want, to give relief to that portion of Italy which is now under the control of Germany. Under the provision, I repeat relief may be extended to enemy countries taken over. I hope the Senator from Texas will reconsider the matter, accept the amendment, and take it to conference, anyway, and let it be considered there.

Mr. TAFT and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The only ground on which Italy could be included in the joint resolution would be on the ground that they had ceased to make war. The only time we could possibly afford relief to people

of Germany would be when they have ceased to make war. So, either it excludes Italy, or it does not mean anything. I think it excludes Italy, and I think it is fully intended that we should distribute relief in Italy and Sicily.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understood that both the distinguished Senator from Texas and the distinguished Senator from Michigan, members of the subcommittee, stated that the purpose of this provision was to include India. I can see a reason for that, and I am perfectly willing that that shall be done, but unless the provision is limited as I suggest, let us see what the result would be. Our bomber planes and other planes have been raining bombs over Berlin, and I presume they have caused a great deal of loss of life and injury to persons and to property. Is it the idea of anyone that we should go to Germany and make reparations for that damage?

For instance, suppose we have destroyed the greater proportion of the buildings in the city of Berlin, is it possible that we are going there and give relief to rehabilitate that city and restore it? What is the use of blowing it up if we are going to make the American people pay the bill for restoring it? It does not seem to me that we ought to provide for it in this joint resolution, and I hope the Senator from Texas will reconsider, and take the amendment to conference.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the amendment, as we know is proposed to be added to the India section. I do not know whether the Senator from Tennessee thinks he is prohibiting U. N. R. R. A. from distributing relief in enemy countries by putting it into the India section. If not, if it only affects India, of course, the amendment does not mean anything.

Mr. McKELLAR. I submitted it to the draftsman of the Senate, who is a very competent and efficient man, and I believe that it will have the effect he says it will have. I told him what we wanted to do, that we wanted to provide for relief in India, as the committee has stated it was their purpose to do; but not to extend it to enemy countries. India is not an enemy country. I presume a number of Senators have been to India and have seen the conditions which have been portrayed here this afternoon—a tremendous horde of poor, dilapidated, and hungry men, women, and children. It would be the height of charity to help them, but in order to help them I do not think we ought to put a provision in the joint resolution by which we would be obligated to help the people in enemy countries.

Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. BREWSTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe the Senator from Kentucky was on his feet first, and I yield to him, and then I shall be glad to yield to other Senators.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that section 4 provides that:

In expressing its approval of this joint resolution, it is the recommendation of Congress that insofar as funds and facilities permit, any area important to the military operations of the United Nations which is stricken by famine or disease may be included in the benefits to be made available through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The crux of that paragraph is found in the words "any area important to the military operations of the United Nations which is stricken by famine or disease." Suppose we go into some Japanese territory in the Pacific, as we have conquered territory that was formerly under Japan, suppose we go into portions of Germany which from a military standpoint will become important to the operations of the United Nations, and we find famine and disease there that would jeopardize even the safety of our own Army. If we included the amendment of the Senator, then we could not do anything to relieve that situation. It seems to me inasmuch as we are undertaking to provide by the section that relief may be afforded in any area important to the military operations of the United Nations, where there is famine and disease, we ought not to restrict it if the area happens to be a strip of enemy territory.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in this war every inch of Germany is important to the military operations of the United Nations; not a single foot of German territory is unimportant to the military operations of the United States in the war, and for us to invade that country and then obligate ourselves at the same time we invade it to furnish relief to those who may be suffering or dying by reason of famine or disease seems to me to be monstrous.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose we go into Germany. As we go into Germany, the territory we take over behind the Army must be administered.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no question about that. That is not what is being referred to here.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Army proceeds, let us say, into the middle of Germany. The Army does not want to take charge of all the territory it may have occupied, and U. N. R. R. A. would take charge in order to relieve it. It is in that sense that the Senator's amendment would even prohibit the U. N. R. R. A. from going in behind the Army at any stage and undertaking to relieve famine and disease which might themselves affect the safety of the Army.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment. When the Army takes charge of any part of Germany, it is not Germany any longer, but it is the property of the United States or of the Allied Nations.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is enemy territory.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; it is anything else but enemy territory. It is Allied territory in the sense of the meaning here. Of course, they would have a right to do it.

I yield now to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the last portion of the paragraph which was read by the Senator from Kentucky. The effect of this section, that is, section 4, is not to amend the agreement but merely to state the recommendation of the Congress in this regard.

I should like to have the opinion of the Senator from Texas, in charge of the joint resolution, as to whether or not section 4 would have any effect whatsoever, so far as the agreement is concerned, or so far as the authorities who will operate under it are concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. If I may be permitted by the Senator from Tennessee to answer—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. So far as the legal effect is concerned, I do not think section 4 has the force of law. Other terms in the agreement and in the preceding portions of the joint resolution, define where the relief shall be expended. As I view it, this is merely a suggestion to the organization, that if they can find a way to do what is needed, it is hoped they will do it.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder whether the Senator would be satisfied if the amendment read, "except areas occupied by the enemy." It seems to me that would reach what the Senator is trying to cover.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it would, and I modify my amendment to that effect.

Mr. TAFT. That would be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. BARKLEY. What effect would the amendment, even as modified, have in Finland, for instance, which is enemy territory to some of the United Nations, although not to us, or in Norway? Would they be regarded as enemy territory?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; neither of them would be regarded as enemy territory, because they are not enemy territory to us, certainly not.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask that the amendment be restated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert on page 15, line 21, after the word "area", the words "except areas occupied by the enemy."

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think there is any danger of our extending any relief to territory actually occupied by the enemy, and I shall not resist the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. OVERTON. Before the amendment is acted on, Mr. President, I should like to say that I do not know that the amendment as modified carries out the intention of the Senator from Tennessee. Suppose some of the United Nations should be occupied by the enemy, suppose a part of England should be occupied by the enemy; could not relief be sent into that territory? I think it should say, "and while occupied by the enemy."

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the suggestion of the Senator is well taken, and I further modify my amendment by accepting his suggestion. Let the clerk state the amendment with that modification. I think clearly it should be so corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment as now modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 21, after the word "area", it is proposed to insert "except within enemy territory and while occupied by the enemy."

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a word, Mr. President. I wish to quote from the report of the committee, on page 9, which shows that there is no purpose to do what the Senator from Tennessee is seeking to prevent:

The policy resolutions adopted by the Council specifically provide, furthermore, that the Council must approve the scale and nature of such operations and that all expenses of operations in an enemy or ex-enemy country should be borne by that country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

No amendment under article VIII (a) of the agreement involving any new obligation for the United States shall be binding upon the United States without approval by joint resolution of Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. It has been worked over by the committee and the State Department, and we have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, some time ago I offered an amendment in line 11, page 11. I wish to withdraw the amendment, because of the suggestion made as to it being mixed up with another provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment was never formally offered, and the Senator has a right to withdraw it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I offer the amendment, which I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

The Director General shall make periodic reports to the Congress of the United States of America covering the Administration's activities.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know that there is any objection to having the amendment agreed to, but the Director General is not an officer of

the United States, he is not under the control of the United States, he is an officer of the organization we are proposing to set up by the agreement. What legal power have we to direct him as to what he shall do with respect to the administration of his office? That is not a captious question, because I think it is generally agreed that we as a Nation, singly, and by ourselves, have no control over the Director General. It happens that today the Director General is an American citizen, but suppose that some time in the near future he should happen to be a British citizen or a Chinese citizen, would we have any right to say to him that he should make a separate report to the Congress of the United States?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. We might not be able to enforce the provision, but so long as we held the purse strings, I think they would submit a report to us.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think they would do that anyway, but the question whether we have the power legally to control the Director General is what we are considering. If we cannot control him, I have some doubt as to the wisdom of making such a gesture.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the purpose of the amendment, but if we are to do what is proposed at all, it seems to me the amendment should be leveled at the American member of the Council, who will be our member. Another safeguard is that before any appropriations are made the organization must come before Congress, and I assume that the one who comes before Congress will be our representative, or the Director General, Mr. Lehman, and he will have to make a report, and we will ask, naturally, what they did with the money previously provided. It seems to me the effect of this might be offensive to some of the other nations, since it might seem that we were assuming to take charge and dictate.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Would the Senator have any objection to the amendment if it were modified so as to read "the American member of the Council," instead of "Director General"?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask the Senator what he finds lacking at the top of page 15, where the language is:

The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures made under any such appropriations and of operations under the agreement.

Is not that the appropriate point at which to require reports?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; I feel that that language refers only to the expenditures and the receipts of money.

Mr. BARKLEY. The whole operation is under the agreement. Not only appropriations but all operations are under the agreement. Everything done is under the agreement.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. My thought was that that language did not go far enough. That is why I submitted my amendment, so as to require someone who could do so

to report to Congress what the organization was doing.

Mr. VANDENBERG. We thought we were doing precisely that thing in the language on the top of page 15.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from South Dakota will not insist on his amendment. It seems to me the language just quoted by the Senator from Michigan completely answers the Senator's suggestion. The language provides that the President shall submit reports. He is the man who is shot at, instead of some subordinate. It seems to me the language is entirely adequate, in addition to the additional safeguard which is provided by the necessity for coming to the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Suppose the President should not submit a report of the organization's activities?

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, someone can always express such a fear. The President, however, does submit reports when it is provided that he shall do so by act of Congress. The President has to come to Congress for every dollar he receives.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. We are still waiting for the report on the Food Congress held last winter.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was not held by direction of Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator from South Dakota will not insist on his amendment. It seems to me the provisions of the bill are quite adequate.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not feel that the provisions of the bill go far enough. Regretting, as I do, not being able to agree with the views expressed by the Senator from Texas, I shall ask for a vote on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have not heard any Senator protest against the proposal that the United States provide \$1,350,000,000 of the money paid into the Treasury by American taxpayers who are so loaded down with debt and weary and tired of taxes now that they can hardly budge. It is proposed that we shall put up \$1,350,000,000 of their money, which we shall need so badly to provide for our veterans when they return, and place that money in the hands of a group of foreigners to do with as they please. As a Member of the United States Senate I protest against it. If there shall be but one vote against the proposal I shall vote against the United States putting up \$1,350,000,000 of the hard-earned money of the weary taxpayers of this country and placing it in the hands of a group of foreigners to do with as they wish.

Mr. President, I can now see that the Senate is going to vote the \$1,350,000,000. In view of the fact that we are putting up two-thirds of the money, and that perhaps, as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] said today, we shall probably put up 90 percent of the money, because all the 43 countries participating in this matter are receiving lend-lease

from us, with the exception of Canada and Liberia—in view of the fact that we are putting up virtually all the money to feed all the world, I think at least 50 percent of the money contributed by us could be spent in the purchase of American farm products and machinery, medicines, and such other things as are going to be used by this world-wide distributing organization.

Therefore, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the figures and words "\$1,350,000,000 in the aggregate", it is proposed to insert "of which 50 percent shall be spent for the purchase of farm products and other supplies in the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that this organization is not controlled by us, that we have only 1 vote in 44, and in view of the fact that we are participating very heavily in this war, and that the lives of our men are in jeopardy in virtually every part of the world, and, in view of the further fact that we are interested in the preservation of the lives of those men, and that we do not want any foreign organization to interfere with our military activities, I maintain that before the proposed international organization composed of 44 nations, in which we have 1 vote, is permitted to go into a territory and to begin its operations, the Chief of Staff of our Army who is in charge of that particular territory should be consulted in order that the activities of this foreign international organization may not interfere with our military operations, or be likely to do damage to any operations which are in the minds of our military authorities to be carried forward.

In line with that thought I offer an amendment which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, after line 4, it is proposed to add a new section as follows:

SEC. 6. No program of relief or rehabilitation or policy contemplated or proposed by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall be placed into operation, without it having first been submitted for approval to the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United Nations in charge of the area in which the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration proposes to operate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, that is already taken care of in the joint resolution where it is provided that within military areas nothing shall be done by the organization without the consent and cooperation of the commander of our armed forces in that territory.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask for the adoption of my amendment, Mr. President, because I think its provisions are specific. I am under the impression that probably

our military commanders would welcome a qualification of that sort, so there would be no question about the organization coming in and interfering with their military program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that our Army is making expenditures of millions of dollars in buying foodstuffs for the purpose of making distribution to the civilians of different countries in which we operate. In view of the fact that we have a Government school in Charlottesville, Va., where we are training men to administer aid and to participate in suggestions relative to government in the respective countries after we enter them, I am rather of the opinion that those individuals whom we have in the field now would be better prepared to handle this relief than any foreign organization we might set up. Therefore, I think the appropriations should be made to the Army to augment the money they have now for that particular purpose in emergency cases. I, therefore, offer an amendment to that effect, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as Congress may determine to be necessary, to the Army and Navy, for use of military governments established in occupied countries for the adequate conduct of relief and rehabilitation and related necessary activities. A complete record shall be maintained by each military government of all expenditures and submitted to Congress in semiannual reports of the Army and Navy, whichever the case may be.

It is proposed to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of funds for use by military governments established in occupied countries in conducting relief and rehabilitation and related activities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I believe we are all in agreement that there is no greater humanitarian organization upon the face of the earth than the American Red Cross. The American Red Cross is considered to be one of the finest organizations of its kind that was ever formed anywhere in the world. For many years it has done a magnificent job, a job of which not only we in America are proud, but of which the people of the world are actually very proud; because during its existence the American Red Cross has administered to the sick, the wounded, and the unfortunate in almost every section of the entire world.

In view of the fact that the American Red Cross is an American organization,

in view of the fact that we are actually to put up 90 percent of all the money to be used under the pending measure, in view of the fact that the American Red Cross already has a world-wide organization, and that we have implicit faith in it, and that all other nations of the world have implicit faith in it, I think the fund should be administered by the American Red Cross.

However, instead of providing in my amendment, or my substitute, as it might be called, that \$1,350,000,000 shall be authorized to be appropriated, I have provided that not to exceed \$350,000,000 in the aggregate shall be authorized to be appropriated. I ask that the Senate direct that the money for relief be distributed by an organization we know, not by an international organization in which we shall have virtually no voice—only one voice among 43 others.

Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed \$350,000,000 in the aggregate, as the Congress of the United States may determine from time to time to be appropriated, and such sums to be used for relief among the populations of areas liberated by the armed forces of the United Nations. Such sums shall be administered solely by the American Red Cross, using the facilities of their international organization.

Sec. 2. The American Red Cross shall submit to Congress quarterly reports of expenditures made under any such appropriations.

Sec. 3. Relief shall be defined as aid in furnishing food, clothing, shelter, the prevention of pestilence, and recovery of health of the peoples of the liberated areas.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint Resolution authorizing an appropriation of funds to be administered by the Red Cross for relief in areas liberated by the armed forces of the United Nations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I submit the last amendment I propose to offer, and send it to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$350,000,000—

Mr. REYNOLDS. No, Mr. President; not \$350,000,000, but \$350,000,000.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$350,000,000 to be expended under the direction of the President, for the furnishing of food, clothing, medicine, and other absolute essentials of life, to relieve starvation and suffering among individuals in those countries which have been overrun by, or have directly suffered from

hostile action of, the enemies of the United Nations in the present war.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to authorize the appropriation of \$350,000,000 for use in relieving starvation and suffering in countries which have been overrun by, or have directly suffered from hostile action of, the enemies of the United Nations in the present war."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the record show that the amendment provides for \$350,000,000,000 or \$350,000,000?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I corrected the clerk's reading of the amount. The amount stated in the amendment is \$350,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amount carried in the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. Three hundred and fifty million dollars.

Mr. REYNOLDS. But, Mr. President, considering the way the Congress appropriates billions of dollars, one might think the amount was \$350,000,000,000 instead of \$350,000,000. I suppose the clerk mentioned \$350,000,000 because the national debt has almost reached that amount at the present time.

Mr. President, I think this matter is of great concern to everyone in America. I do not desire to take up very much of the time of the Senate in discussing the amendment. I have offered the amendments in order that my record may be clear. I want the American people to know I am not going to vote \$1,350,000,000 for a group of foreigners and aliens in an international organization to spend all over the world.

I submitted the amendment to cut down the amount to \$350,000,000; \$350,000,000 is a great deal of money—a very great deal of money. We do not know where the money will be spent; we do not know to what particular use it will be put. We know it will be spent in stricken countries, but at the same time we do not know exactly what organizations there will be called upon to make the distribution; because in an organization of this kind there is bound to be some politics. It is almost inevitable that there will be some politics in it—just as we see today, in Italy, a fight occurring between the Fascists and the Communists, and just as we see occurring in Yugoslavia today a fight between the Fascists and Communists.

We in the United States are being called upon to put up virtually all the money to be used to feed all the world, just as if we had not already done everything possible in that direction. Mr. President, we have done a great deal. Not only have we done a great deal through governmental action, but let us see what we are doing through private activities. I read a brief newspaper article which bears on that point:

SOVIETS GIVEN \$16,781,333 IN RELIEF GOODS LAST YEAR

NEW YORK, February 14.—Russian War Relief, Inc., announced today that \$16,781,333.74 worth of clothing, medical supplies, and mis-

cellaneous articles were consigned through it to the Soviet Union last year.

In a report to the agency's board of directors, Edward C. Carter, president of the organization, said that clothing comprised 70.07 percent of the shipments; medical supplies, 20.42 percent; seeds, food, and miscellaneous items, 4.35.

Mr. Carter said that of the relief goods consigned \$7,742,430 was contributed in goods by Americans. The remainder was received in cash contributions through war chests and the National War Fund, he said. Administrative, promotion, and operating costs total 4.43 percent of income, the report stated, an amount which Mr. Carter said was believed to be the lowest ever achieved by a comparable agency.

The 1944 goal, recently announced, is \$21,000,000, which includes a \$9,000,000 allocation from the National War Fund.

So, Mr. President, we find that from private charitable sources the Soviets were given \$16,781,333.74 worth of clothing, medical supplies, and other articles last year, and that the goal for this year is \$21,000,000, to be collected in this country and to be sent to the Soviets.

I think we have done our part, and I am protesting about our chucking away the money of the taxpayers of our country.

Mr. President, the reason why I keep harping on the matter is because, scattered all over the world we have 10,000,000 or 11,000,000 men and women in uniform who are dying and bleeding and suffering. When the war is over, we shall have to take care of their widows and their orphaned children, and we shall have to take care of hundreds of thousands of invalids—veterans who will be armless, legless, blind, or deranged. The question is, when the war is over will we have the money with which to take care of our own veterans who will have gone forth to fight for the "four freedoms" throughout the world?

I am interested in that, and I think the time has come to cut down the amount to be authorized. If we approve the pending measure as it now stands, it will really be our recommendation for an appropriation of \$1,350,000,000. Of course, Mr. President, we all want to help those who are afflicted. We all appreciate the suffering which is being experienced by the unfortunate people in the invaded countries, and our heart goes out to them in sympathy. But, Mr. President, charity must begin at home. If we give away everything now, what shall we have left for our own veterans when the war is over? And only God knows when the war will end. No one else knows. The war may last for years.

I am pleading today in the interest of our men and women—our soldiers who are fighting on 72 fronts throughout the world. I hope to God we will save enough so that we shall be able to buy the medicine and food and to furnish the nurses required in order to take care of the hundreds of thousands of wounded who will return to this country after the war is over. I ask for a vote on the question of cutting down the amount from \$1,350,000,000 to \$350,000,000. Let us give away \$350,000,000. We have plenty. They will do what they want with it. But for God's sake, let

us save \$1,000,000,000 of this money for our own soldiers.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article written by Constantine Brown in his column entitled "This Changing World," and a newspaper article in reference to a young American hero who has returned to this country blind, broke, and 20.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of January 25, 1944]

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

If a section of the United States were hit by a major tragedy and funds for its relief and rehabilitation had to be obtained by private contribution in which, say, Thomas Lamont, was the principal contributor, no one would be surprised if his representative were given a decisive voice in the distribution of the funds.

It appears, however, that what seems logical in regard to domestic affairs is not logical in a large-scale international undertaking.

Congress has been asked to appropriate \$1,350,000,000 for the relief and rehabilitation of the devastated and hungry areas of the war-stricken world.

The people of the United States never have been stingy in assisting other nations when they were in distress. Americans contributed hundreds of millions after the World War to feed not only our former associates, but they sent aid into Russia, which at that time was ostracized by our Government, and into Armenia to save millions of people from starvation.

The relief and rehabilitation of Europe, the United Nations Governments have decided among themselves, must no longer be based on charity. All parties concerned must do their bit to raise a large fund to help the starved peoples of Europe and Asia soon after their liberation from the Axis yoke. Industries and public utilities which have suffered so much from the "torch" policy of the Germans and the Japanese and from aerial warfare, will have to be restored to permit quick economic rehabilitation. The devastated areas comprise practically the whole of Europe—with the exception of the few remaining neutral countries—and the major portion of China.

For this purpose the United States, which has the largest national income of the world, probably will be assessed an amount equal to 1 percent of its 1943 income.

It is immaterial whether or not the 1943 figure represents the real income of the United States or is an inflated amount due to war conditions. It is argued in some quarters that American industry will remain very busy long after the war, since it will be forced to produce for the whole civilized world everything from hairpins to machine tools and planes.

But what appears important to many legislators—even though they are going to vote for the required appropriations—is that while the American taxpayer is the heaviest contributor to this undertaking, the United States has only a 25-percent voice in the handling of both relief and rehabilitation.

A committee of four forms the directing council of the U. N. R. R. A., in which Britain, Russia, China, and the United States are represented with equal voice, although there is a most unequal contribution of funds.

Nations which are to receive assistance are to be consulted whenever their own countries are involved, but do not participate in the framing of the U. N. R. R. A.'s general policies.

The United States Government was careful to see there was no hitch in this United Nations' attempt to present a solid front to the world. The whole matter was presented to the country as the first endeavor of the associated powers to work in complete harmony and on the surface the project does not seem to involve any controversial political problem. But it appears that with the best will in the world politics cannot be kept out of the organization.

Definite trends and a race for jockeying for political domination are only too obvious in Europe today.

The Russians are in the midst of an offensive in old Poland. In Yugoslavia there is a bitter fight between the representatives of King Peter and those of Moscow. A similar situation is said to exist in Greece. In Italy there seems to be an ill-concealed struggle between the supporters and nonsupporters of the House of Savoy. In France several factions are preparing for a fight for power after the Nazis have been eliminated and Gen. Charles de Gaulle hopes he will be the man who will guide his country's destinies. There are many who still oppose him.

Feeding the starved people of all these countries will be a strong trump card for the would-be leaders. Food in a starved country is far more important than gold, and the organization which has the key to the larder in its pocket can impose itself on that country.

If the council of four were composed of representatives of countries not involved in the game of power politics we could look on it as an adequate directorate to insure a fair distribution of the materials purchased largely with the American taxpayer's money. But unfortunately both Britain and Russia are involved in that game and their representatives might be tempted into some sort of "patronage" which would help their protégés obtain political supremacy, for a while, at least.

The fact that America has no decisive vote in the U. N. R. R. A. is likely to get this country involved in the game of power politics when we favor unwittingly the formation of this or that puppet government in Europe.

RETURN OF A HERO: BLIND, BROKE, AND 20

MCCLOUD, CALIF., February 12.—Young Robert Wetzel has been led back home from the wars in Italy—back to the beloved mountains he no longer can see. He arrived with \$2 in his pocket, a Japanese-American soldier for an escort and a receipt showing his Government would not even buy a pair of glasses to cover his sightless eyes.

A receipt made out by the post exchange of McCloskey Hospital, Temple, Tex., acknowledges that Wetzel paid \$8 for glasses—Wetzel paid, not the Army. Date: January 24.

He asked for his new glasses, for there was—and is—a chance he will see again. But the Army doctor, as Wetzel recalls the words, said:

"If you could be put in shape to fight again, the Army would pay for the glasses. But since you are being discharged, you will have to pay for them yourself."

BLIND VET AT 20

Bob Wetzel was 19 when he entered the Army, scarcely 20 when he came back, a blind veteran, to this mountain community, where his father works in the office of the lumber company.

He was in that spearhead formed by Company I, One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Infantry, the night of October 13 when the Volturno churned red with blood. They crossed the Volturno, established the beachhead.

But that beachhead was a thicket of land mines, Wetzel heard an artillery shell com-

ing, dived into a ditch—and landed on a mine.

His left eye was literally torn from its socket. Three fragments pierced the right eye. He was totally blind.

It was five hospitals and 70 days from the Appennines of Italy to the Siskiyous of California.

An Army major came one day and told him of a bitter failure.

"They had tried to take those splinters out of my right eye with a magnet and it didn't work," said Wetzel.

"But he said there was a chance that corrective glasses might restore vision to my right eye."

From that moment he lived for the day when treatment could begin. They fitted him with his first glasses and soon he could see shadows, only shadows. But it was seeing.

The problem, they told him, was one of constant adjustment of the lens to strengthen the eye.

Two weeks later the blow fell. He was told he was being discharged.

"Of course, I wanted to get back home," Wetzel related, "so I didn't feel so badly about it."

"But if I was going to see again, I thought they should do everything they could now. I thought they could keep me and transfer me to a hospital near home."

PAID FOR GLASSES

"I wanted the new glasses right away, but the doctor just gave me a prescription and told me to get it filled at the post exchange. So I went and paid the \$8, but haven't received the glasses yet."

He was placed in a hospital car with a Japanese-American corporal as an escort to deliver him home.

Wetzel's father concluded the recital:

"Bob is not bitter. He thinks the Army is grand. We all do. But perhaps the public should know about cases like Bobby's. We're thinking about all the thousands of other wounded men."

"Bob has a mother and father to come to, and the American Legion is handling his case."

"But what about the men who won't have a family to come home to?"

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, because of the fact that I have been serving as a member of the conference committee which has been holding both morning and afternoon sessions, it has been impossible or impracticable for me to be present during much of the debate in the Senate on this very important subject. I do not intend to take more than a minute or two of the time of the Senate.

I believe that when a measure of this kind is before the Senate of the United States for approval or disapproval, the Senate is facing one of the most important problems it has faced, at least during my short period of service here. I am not willing to vote without at least registering for the RECORD some of my thoughts on the matter. My remarks shall be very brief, I can assure the Senate.

Mr. President, I can remember the trainloads of relief supplies which were collected in the prairie States of the West, including my own State of Nebraska following the last war. I was then engaged in the milling and grain business and in the manufacture of flour. I know that the millers from all over the United States solicited trainloads and shiploads of flour, which

were taken to the devastated areas of Europe and distributed through relief organizations. Some of our most distinguished people joined in that work and donated their time and effort, and performed valuable services, indeed.

I am of the opinion that today the American people are just as liberal as they were at that time; they are just as anxious to help in the terrible catastrophe which faces many of the people who live in the war-devastated areas; and I am sure the American people will come to the rescue. But here we are adopting a different policy. We are saying to the people who gave of their might in the previous war situation, "This time the Government will take charge of relief."

If one is a stockholder in a large corporation, does he think for a minute that his duty as a citizen is fulfilled when the board of directors or the president of the corporation gives \$1,000, \$10,000, or \$100,000 for relief? The man who wants to give wants to give as an individual. If relief is to be administered through a corporation—and in this instance our Government is acting in the capacity of a corporation—if we give the last penny of the substance of this Nation, no individual citizen will feel in his heart that he has contributed to the solution of the problem.

I for one want the people of America to decide how charitable they wish to be. I have no doubt that they will be charitable to the extreme limit in this catastrophe, as they were in the previous catastrophe.

I do not know how I can register my protest against a measure of this kind, meritorious as it may be, without casting my vote in the negative. At the same time, I want the Members of this body, and others who may look at the vote in the Record, to understand that I expect them to be as liberal in this instance as they have always been in the past. I do not wish to create an organization behind which everyone can hide and say, "I have made my donation through the Treasury of the United States by paying taxes; therefore, I do not wish to contribute at this time."

I do not believe that we, as a government, have any more right than have the officers of a corporation to become the charity organization for each individual citizen of this country. I, for one, want to give. I expect to give, and I have no doubt that the people of America will give liberally. However, I am sure they will not like the idea of setting up a tremendous relief organization, in which much of the money will be wasted in administration, and in which they will have no opportunity to decide where their gifts shall go.

In my State—and I know the statement applies to other States—there are many distinguished citizens of wealth, as well as citizens of very ordinary means, who came from some of the war-torn countries of Europe and elsewhere, or whose ancestors came from those countries. For years they have been contributing liberally to organizations which gave relief to the people in their fatherland. They will do so again. They

would give a thousand times more as individuals to an organization of that kind than they would give to the Treasury of the United States to become their representative in charity.

I for one hope that the people of America will continue to be as charitable as they have been in the past, and that they will continue to give in the old-fashioned way, a method by which they know that their contributions reach those whom they wish to help. Because of that principle, I shall have to vote against the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS].

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to have the Record show that I tried to save the United States a billion dollars, and also to show how I voted on the proposal. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, a short time ago I sent to the desk an amendment which I asked to have lie on the table. I now offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is not in order at this time. There is an amendment pending. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I could not give my support to the joint resolution in its original form, previous to the amendments which were adopted this afternoon. After studying the measure and hearing it fully discussed, I am still unwilling to vote for it so long as the amount which we are authorizing to be expended remains at \$1,350,000,000. I should be willing to go to a limit of \$500,000,000 of absolute commitment if the joint resolution were so amended as to provide such an amount. I am unwilling to go beyond that point at the very beginning of this most extensive program of relief throughout the world which is to be conducted at our expense.

I wish my country to do its part. I wish my Government to share the responsibility of all civilization in the performance of humanitarian works necessary and incidental to the catastrophe which has come upon the world. I think we should be acting very generously if we should provide an authorization of \$500,000,000 at this time.

I give this reason for not wanting to go further: In the first place, Mr. President, I do not agree to many of the terms and provisions of the agreement which has been entered into. I do not like at all the idea or principle of the United States furnishing 67½ percent of all the money which is to be expended under the terms of the joint resolution, and at the same time turning over to other nations which are participating, and some nations which are not participating in the contribution of the over-all relief fund, the control of our money. That is exactly what is proposed. The Council would be composed of representatives from 44 nations or authorities signing the agreement, including our own representative, who would have only one vote. Russia, which would

make no contribution whatsoever to the fund to be distributed and expended, would have an equal vote with the representative of the United States in the control and distribution of the fund. From my viewpoint, that is one of the serious objections to the joint resolution.

Even with the amendment which I have suggested, I should very much dislike to vote for the joint resolution, but I should be willing to yield my better judgment and go along if I could be assured that we are to retain the control to the extent of the obligations to be created by the Council of the relief authority.

Mr. President, there is another provision in the articles of agreement which causes me to take the position I take with reference to the amount of the authorization which we are about to make, and that is that we cannot withdraw from this agreement, or from whatever obligation we incur, for a period of 1 year after giving notice of withdrawal. We must first give 6 months' notice, and then we are not permitted to withdraw for 1 year thereafter. That, Mr. President, represents more than half of the time for which this authorization would be made.

It has been said that we hold control of the money because the Administration must come back to Congress for an appropriation. Mr. President, then we authorize the appropriation of \$1,350,000,000, I know from my observation and legislative experience in the Congress that we have already gone more than half the way; indeed, we have gone two-thirds of the way toward actual expenditure of the money. I am not ready today to go that far with \$1,350,000,000. I am ready to go that far with half a billion dollars, which I think is very generous.

I would rather put that limitation on the authorization now so that in the course of the expenditure of the money, and in the course of the operation of the U. N. R. R. A. up until the time that authorization is exhausted by the expenditures which will be made under the authority of the authorization, we can have an opportunity to see how this organization is working, how it is being administered, and how its affairs are being conducted. Then we can determine, after having had such an opportunity, whether this Nation and we as the Congress wish to commit this Government to any further part of the program outlined and in process of execution by the U. N. R. R. A. It is true that we can keep our hands on the purse strings; but if we provide this authorization we shall morally obligate this Government for every dollar of it, and I am not ready to go that far at this time.

Mr. President, I wish to make one further observation in reference to the withdrawal provision. We cannot withdraw even at the end of a year and a half unless our Government has by that time met all financial, supply, or other material obligations accepted or undertaken by it.

According to my interpretation of the language of the joint resolution, if we make an authorization today of \$1,350,000,000, there will be, in my judgment,

an obligation for us to perform to that extent before we can withdraw from it. I do not know that we shall ever want to withdraw. I hope the organization will be so conducted that we will never want to withdraw from it. However, Mr. President, I want the Congress to keep its hands on the purse strings and to reduce the amount of the authorization to half a billion dollars or less. Then, if additional appropriations are requested, we can make an additional authorization when the time comes. We shall have an opportunity then to look at the picture, obtain reports, and know how the enterprise is operating. In that way we can better judge the situation. There is no reason why we cannot determine about another authorization at the time when an additional appropriation is needed.

Mr. President, if the joint resolution is amended so as to provide a limit of \$500,000,000 in the authorization, with the amendments agreed to this afternoon, one of which, that offered by the Senator from Tennessee, prohibits the making of obligations by the Council and by the administrator of this authority beyond the amounts of appropriations already made, we shall be able to retain essential safeguards, which I think we ought to retain for the protection of our own Government and our own people in launching this tremendous enterprise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] to reduce the authorization from \$1,350,000,000 to \$350,000,000. The clerk will resume the calling of the roll.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to modify my amendment by limiting the amount of the authorization to \$500,000,000 instead of \$350,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the calling of the roll has been started and one Senator has voted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from North Carolina has modified his amendment so that the amount of the authorization is to be \$500,000,000 instead of \$350,000,000.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the roll call has started and one Senator has voted. Discussion is not in order. Furthermore, after the yeas and nays have once been ordered, a modification of the amendment is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will resume the calling of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I do not know how he would vote

if he were present, and I, therefore, withhold my vote.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. LANGER's name was called). I have been asked to announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent on business of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if present and voting he would vote as I have voted, and, therefore, I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WAGNER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is detained from the Senate by illness. If present and voting he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is detained from the Senate by a slight cold. He has a pair with his colleague, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I am advised that if present and voting the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "nay."

The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained from the Senate on public business.

If present and voting the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "nay."

If present and voting the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is detained attending the funeral of Representative Schuetz, of Illinois.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and Mr. SCRUGHAM, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] are detained on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator

from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—17

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bushfield	McClellan	Wheeler
Butler	Moore	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	O'Daniel	Willis
Clark, Mo.	Overton	Wilson
Ellender	Reynolds	

NAYS—47

Andrews	Gerry	Murray
Austin	Gillette	Nye
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Ball	Guffey	Stewart
Barkley	Gurney	Taft
Bilbo	Hatch	Thomas, Okla.
Brewster	Hayden	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Holman	Tunnell
Capper	Jackson	Vandenberg
Caraway	La Follette	Wagner
Connally	McFarland	Wallgren
Danaher	McKellar	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Maloney	Weeks
Eastland	Maybank	White
Ferguson	Mead	Wiley
George	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—32

Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Bridges	Kilgore	Russell
Brooks	Langer	Scruggam
Buck	Lucas	Smith
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McNary	Tobey
Chavez	Millikin	Truman
Downey	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Glass	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Hawkes	Reed	

So Mr. REYNOLDS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 1, line 4, to strike out the figures "\$1,350,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$500,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I have sent an amendment to the desk, which I now offer and ask to have stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend article X, on page 15, by the insertion of the following:

Sec. 5. None of the funds appropriated in pursuance of this authorization shall be expended in the promotion of any educational, religious, or political program in any country in which rehabilitation is carried on.

In the first line on page 11, it is proposed that "Sec. 3" be changed to "Sec. 6."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I have no desire to cast any reflection on the good faith of the proponents of the joint resolution, or on those who have already been appointed to administer it.

It is unfortunate that many of us are to be measured as to our desire for permanent world cooperation by our vote upon the pending measure.

It is unfortunate that the joint resolution was not submitted to the Senate without the request for an authorization, so that it could have been worked out thoroughly, and could then have repre-

sented the sentiment of the Congress. It is unfortunate that the people of this country have had no opportunity to express themselves upon the objectives of the joint resolution. It has been drawn by the Executive, and placed before us on a very nebulous foundation.

I say again that it is unfortunate that we have not had opportunity thoroughly to work out the provisions of the pending joint resolution, and thus give adequate expression to the views of those of us who are anxious that we should cooperate in a real and practical movement for rehabilitation of the countries which have been devastated by the war. I have no objection to the appropriation of this vast sum of money for the relief of war-stricken areas. I do say, however, that if we are to provide two-thirds of the money, the high purpose and good will of America should not be submerged by distribution under the administration of twoscore nations which supply the other third. If we subscribe two-thirds of the stock, we certainly should control the business.

Many of us are anxious that other provisions be added to the joint resolution. Many of us are anxious that some means be provided to take care of the starving women and children in the lands which are already occupied by the armies of the Allies, and also in those lands where the Axis Powers are in control. Starving women and children will provide a very weak foundation for those countries for tomorrow. Taking care of them is a present crying need, and a solution of this problem might have been worked out in connection with the joint resolution by proper consideration of it.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely want to call attention to the fact that the Senate recently adopted a resolution calling upon the State Department to initiate negotiations with the British and others to provide relief for children in the occupied areas to which the Senator refers. The matter could not very well have been included in the pending joint resolution. If what he suggests is to be done, it will have to be done by the International Red Cross. It would have to be the subject of negotiation with the British with regard to relaxation of the blockade. So I think Congress has done all it could, and I have no doubt that the State Department will proceed under the request of Congress to negotiate for the relief the Senator has in mind.

Incidentally, all the countries concerned are willing to provide their own money, so we do not have to furnish money for that particular undertaking. I think it should be perfectly clear that this joint resolution is entirely consistent with the resolution already adopted, and Congress has gone on record, and has asked the State Department to proceed with the other relief to which the Senator refers.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator. I was not present on the day when the resolution was agreed to, but I am in hearty sympathy with it. The effort has been too long delayed. It seems to me it could well have been made a part of the

program we are considering, inasmuch as some of the nations in this present plan have heretofore resisted, and may continue to resist, the effort to provide relief for starving women and children.

Mr. GILLETTE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I suggest to the Senator that, if I understood his proposed amendment right, it proposes to amend article X, on page 15. Article X is a part of the article having to do with United Nations Rehabilitation and Relief, and is not subject to amendment. There is no portion of it on page 15 which is part of the joint resolution and subject to amendment. I am afraid the Senator has not applied his proposed amendment as it should be applied.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I modify my amendment by providing "at the proper place in the joint resolution insert the following"—

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. May we have the amendment stated again?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the joint resolution it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be expended in the promotion of any educational, religious, or political program in any country in which rehabilitation is carried on.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to provide a safeguard against expansion by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration into the fields of governmental ideology. I am free to say that nowhere in the resolution can one find any provision which might be construed as authority for any such extension on the part of the administration. In the last few years, however, we have seen the present administration exercise the dubious policy of going out into fields entrance into which was not definitely barred by legislation. I wish to have the Senate provide a safeguard for the American people against deviation by the organization from the policy set forth in the agreement, so there may be no expansion by it into fields of governmental ideology. For that purpose, I have offered my amendment.

Since the beginning of the war we have seen the administration exploit many different forms of governmental ideology to the world and to the American people. The administration has talked about the "four freedoms." We have heard something about the Atlantic Charter. These matters all seem to have been forgotten, and now we have this new kind of world organization offered to us. Therefore I am proposing my amendment, so as to provide a safeguard against such expansion as I have spoken of, and so that we may still keep faith with the nations of the world, to assure them that the American people have no purpose and no desire to force any specific ideology, much less our own system in America, upon other nations of the world.

Mr. President, I think we should make clear that none of the funds which are to be appropriated from time to time for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall be used for the purpose of propagandizing for any new system of politics or religion or education. I regret that we could not have had an opportunity to amend the agreement itself to the same effect. The only way I know of providing such a limitation is by keeping our hands upon the purse, and saying that no fund shall be used for such purposes.

Mr. President, I hope to have the hearty and sympathetic support of the Senate for this amendment.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. LANGER's name was called). I make the same announcement as before, that the Senator from North Dakota is absent from the city on official business.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

Mr. WAGNER (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is detained from the Senate by illness. If present and voting he would vote "Nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is detained from the Senate by a slight cold. He has a pair with his colleague, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained from the Senate on public business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has been called from the Senate to attend a conference.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is detained attending the

funeral of the late Representative Schuetz, of Illinois.

The senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] are detained on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—45		
Aiken	Ellender	O'Daniel
Andrews	Ferguson	Reynolds
Austin	George	Shipstead
Barkley	Gerry	Taft
Brewster	Gurney	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Holman	Vandenberg
Bushfield	Jackson	Wagner
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Walsh, N. J.
Capper	La Follette	Weeks
Caraway	McClellan	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Wherry
Connally	Maloney	White
Danaher	Mead	Wiley
Davis	Moore	Willis
Eastland	Nye	Wilson

NAYS—18		
Bailey	Hatch	Overton
Ball	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	McFarland	Stewart
Gillette	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Green	Murdock	Tunnell
Guffey	Murray	Wallgren

NOT VOTING—33		
Bankhead	Hawkes	Reed
Bone	Hill	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Brooks	Kilgore	Russell
Buck	Langer	Scrugham
Byrd	Lucas	Smith
Chandler	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chavez	McNary	Tobey
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Truman
Downey	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Glass	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.

So Mr. WILLIS' amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, before the yea-and-nay vote is taken, I ask

unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD—I shall not read it, in order to save time—a letter and memorandum with reference to the expenditures by this Government for relief during and following World War No. 1. This tabulation includes money which was loaned for specific relief purposes, as well as money which was appropriated directly or contributed. The tabulation shows that the Government of the United States expended in these loans and gifts of all kinds approximately \$2,600,000,000, rather than the \$1,350,000,000 carried by the pending joint resolution.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1943.
The Honorable DEAN ACHESON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ACHESON: I send you herewith a memorandum on the cost of relief and rehabilitation to the United States in World War No. 1.

There appears to be a great deal of confusion as to what exactly is meant by loans, advances, or grants, so I think this attached memorandum should be considered only as an approximation and not used authoritatively in detail.

Very sincerely yours,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

THE COST OF RELIEF AND REHABILITATION TO THE UNITED STATES IN WORLD WAR NO. 1

1. The total cost to the United States of financing relief and rehabilitation in continental Europe in World War No. 1 is estimated at approximately \$2,600,000,000. (See attached table.)

2. Of this \$2,600,000,000, some \$2,300,000,000 represents United States Government loans directly or indirectly for relief and rehabilitation. Approximately \$1,000,000,000 of the \$2,300,000,000 were loans directly for relief purposes, primarily for foodstuffs. The remaining \$1,300,000,000 was spent by foreign governments for relief and rehabilitation supplies against general credits established by the United States Treasury. Only about 10 percent of the \$2,300,000,000 of loans was repaid; the remaining 90 percent was, in effect, a gift.

3. The estimated total cost to the United States of financing relief and rehabilitation to continental Europe, \$2,600,000,000, was 4 percent of the national income for 1919, which is estimated at \$64,200,000,000.¹ The \$2,300,000,000 of relief and rehabilitation loans by the United States Government comprised 3.6 percent of the 1919 national income, and the \$1,000,000,000 of direct United States Government relief loans totaled 1.5 percent of the national income of that year.

4. The scope of relief covered by the above figures cannot properly be compared with the prospective cost of relief and rehabilitation after the present war, in view of differences in the geographic areas involved, in the composition of relief and rehabilitation supplies required, in the degree of devastation, and in the number of displaced persons, to mention only leading differences.

¹ The estimate of national income is from National Income and Its Composition, 1919-38, by Simon Kuznets, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1941, p. 137, table 1.

Financing of relief and rehabilitation in continental Europe by United States public and private agencies, World War No. 1¹

[In millions of dollars]

1. U. S. Government relief loans: ²	
(a) Prearmistice (to Belgium).....	223.2
(b) Armistice and post-armistice.....	778.3
	1,001.5
2. Other United States loans to continental Europe, Dec. 1, 1919, to Nov. 1, 1920 ²	1,266.0
3. U. S. Government gifts.....	37.0
4. Gifts of private agencies.....	340.0
Total.....	2,644.5

¹ Source: Relief Deliveries and Relief Loans, 1919-23, and Europe's Overseas Needs, 1919-20, and How They Were Met, League of Nations, 1943.

² Only 5 or 6 percent was repaid.

FOOTNOTES TO TABLE 1

NOTE.—Numbers of footnotes refer to items in table 1. Reference is to relief deliveries and relief loans, 1919-23, unless otherwise stated.

1. (a) P. 56, footnote 1, column 10. Official figure of Committee for Relief in Belgium.

1. (b) P. 55. These loans were made by:

1. Liberty loans.

2. U. S. Liquidation Commission.

3. American Relief Administration and U. S. Grain Corporation.

2. Europe's Overseas Needs, 1919-20, and How They Were Met, League of Nations, 1943, pages 25-27, tables 14 and 15. This figure represents mainly United States Treasury advances in addition to the direct relief loans in item 1 (b). Total advances of \$2,560, less \$778 for direct relief loans, less \$215 for advances to the United Kingdom gives the figure of \$1,567 for 1919 and 1920. To this may be added advances during December 1918 of \$193, giving a total of \$1,770. If expenditures not directly related to relief and rehabilitation are deducted, amounting to \$504, the figure is \$1,266, which is the figure given in the table.

3. Page 7, table 1.

4. Page 7, table 1, and page 26, table 8B.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. CAPPER's name was called). The senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] has been called from the Chamber. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. MCKELLAR (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] who is absent attending the funeral of the late Representative Schuetz. Not knowing how the junior Senator from New Mexico would vote, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am advised, however, that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who

is absent on public business. I am advised that the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea." I vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that he would vote as I have voted. Therefore, I permit my vote to stand.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

My colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness. I am advised that if he were present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on public business.

I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who is detained in a conference, is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who would vote "yea" if present, is detained because of a slight cold. He has a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERT-

SON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

I am advised that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—47

Alken	George	Murray
Andrews	Gerry	Nye
Austin	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Stewart
Ball	Gurney	Taft
Barkley	Hatch	Thomas, Okla.
Bilbo	Hayden	Thomas, Utah
Brewster	Holman	Tunnell
Burton	Jackson	Vandenberg
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Wagner
Connally	La Follette	Wallgren
Danaher	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Maloney	Weeks
Eastland	Maybank	White
Ellender	Mead	Wiley
Ferguson	Murdock	

NAYS—14

Bushfield	Moore	Wheeler
Butler	O'Daniel	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	Overton	Willis
Gillette	Reynolds	Wilson
McClellan	Shipstead	

NOT VOTING—35

Bankhead	Hawkes	Reed
Bone	Hill	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Brooks	Kilgore	Russell
Buck	Langer	Scrugham
Byrd	Lucas	Smith
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McKellar	Tobey
Chavez	McNary	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Tydings
Downey	O'Mahoney	Walsh, Mass.
Glass	Pepper	

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) was passed.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1140) to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That there shall be in the Department of the Interior an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall perform such duties in the Department of the Interior as shall be prescribed by the Secretary, or may be required by law. The Assistant Secretaries of the Interior shall be without numerical distinction of rank and shall have salaries of \$9,000 per annum. The additional office provided for by this act shall cease to exist at the expiration of 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by the President by proclamation or by the Congress by concurrent resolution.

Mr. HATCH. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House. The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO CONVEY LAND

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, on Tuesday the Senate passed Senate bill 1657, to amend an act to empower the

Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land. On the same day the House passed an identical House bill, H. R. 4059. Therefore, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I shall ask unanimous consent that House bill 4059 be considered, with a view to its passage, in which case I shall ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the Senate passed Senate bill 1657, a bill to amend an act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land, be reconsidered, and that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4059.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The House bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4059) to amend an act entitled "An act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land" (approved April 28, 1922).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 1657 was passed is reconsidered, and the bill will be indefinitely postponed.

SALE OF FISH IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, on Tuesday the Senate passed Senate bill 1641, relative to the sale of shad or herring in the District of Columbia. On the same day the House passed an identical bill, House bill 3997.

Therefore, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I shall ask unanimous consent that the House bill be taken up, with a view to its passage, in which event I shall ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 1641 was passed, and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3997.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3997) to amend the Code of the District of Columbia providing for the sale of fish of the shad or herring species, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3997) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 1641 was passed is reconsidered, and the bill is indefinitely postponed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Sundry employees for appointment and/or promotion in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., of Douglaston, N. Y., to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of Robert E. Hannegan, resigned; and Joseph T. Sylvester, of Portland, Maine, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine. (Reappointment.)

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters; and Frederick G. Newell, to be postmaster at Niagara Falls, N. Y., in place of E. V. Canavan, deceased (reported adversely).

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY—SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Martin Travieso to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John P. McMahon to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these two nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

STANDARD OF IDENTITY OF DRY-MILK SOLIDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the unfinished business is House bill 149, the title of which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 149) to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry-milk solids was announced as next in order.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have been asked by a number of Senators what the prospect is for legislation next week. The unfinished business will no doubt be disposed of within an hour or two on Monday. Barring the possibility of a veto message, which must go first to the House, and which, if the veto is sustained there, will not come to the Senate, I do not anticipate much legislation of importance next week. It may be possible for us to take a recess from Monday until Thursday, and from Thursday until the following Monday, depending upon contingencies which are not absolutely certain at this moment. However, on the whole, I believe that the program will not be heavy next week.

I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 21, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 17 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonels with rank from February 1, 1944

Lt. Col. Edward Caswell Wallington, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Carl Ernest Hocker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. John William Leonard, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Richmond Trumbull Gibson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John McDonald Thompson, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. James Alward Van Fleet, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Edward Gill Sherburne, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Walter Wood Hess, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Michael Frank Davis, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. John Fuller Davis, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Carl Randolph Mitchell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 1, 1944.

Lt. Col. Michael Gerard Healy, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 3, 1944.

Lt. Col. Martin Fred DuFrenne, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 13, 1944.

Lt. Col. Philip Lewis Cook, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 18, 1944.

Lt. Col. Charles Fremont Snell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 21, 1944.

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Howland Allan Gibson, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 1, 1944.

Maj. Edward John Kallus, Medical Corps, with rank from March 5, 1944, subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Otis Blaine Schreuder, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 29, 1944.

To be major

Capt. Robert Purcell Rea, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 20, 1944.

To be captains

First Lt. Alf Torp Haerem, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from March 18, 1944, subject to examination required by law.

First Lt. Stanley David Burton, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 20, 1944.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Warren Charles Caldwell, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 12, 1944.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. James Melvin Epperly, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 8, 1944.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonel

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Philip Francis Coholan, United States Army, with rank from March 7, 1944.

To be captains

Chaplain (First Lt.) Marvin Earl Utter, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from January 31, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Loren Thomas Jenks, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from March 3, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Gervase George Sherwood, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from March 3, 1944, subject to examination required by law.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Ralph Henry Pugh, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from March 4, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) James Clarke Griffin, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from March 12, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) John Bartholomew Day, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from March 24, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Charles Edwin Brown, Jr., United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from March 27, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Steve Pettie Gaskins, Jr., United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from March 29, 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 17 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

Martin Travieso to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

John P. McMahon to be associate judge of the municipal court of the District of Columbia.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Irene E. Hodges, Ashville.

COLORADO

Edna A. Kennedy, Peetz.
Alice J. Reed, Sanford.
Merrill D. Harshman, Wiggins.

GEORGIA

Melcena Royal, Ambrose.
Floyd L. Crawford, Appling.
Billy S. Hickman, Colbert.
Cleone M. Fincher, Culloden.

KENTUCKY

Mary M. Stahr, Hickman.

MASSACHUSETTS

Josephine M. Welsh, Sudbury.
Elizabeth C. Kelley, Thorndike.

NORTH CAROLINA

Elizabeth P. Bailey, Advance.
Lawrence G. Garvin, Avondale.
Manning B. Mahafee, Caldeen.
Albert K. Dickens, Castalia.
Edelweiss Mishoe, Castle Hayne.
Thomas G. Long, East Rockingham.
Margueritte M. Wells, Henrietta.
Zora Leah Thomas, Hiddenite.
Ruth B. Hickey, Hiwassee Dam.
Ruth R. Wyatt, Hobgood.
Grace Pugh, Hudson.
Carl P. Linn, Landis.
Marion H. Current, Leicester.
Margaret L. Rourke, Leland.
Lottie S. Campbell, Lucama.
Arthur Lee Nicholson, Macon.
Annie F. Briscoe, Mill Spring.
James R. Crutchfield, Moncure.
Elma B. Harris, Mooresboro.
Bessie C. Cox, Newton Grove.
Samuel P. Covington, Pinnacle.
Lawrence V. Sigmon, Rosman.
Sue C. Worsham, Ruffin.
McLain L. Furr, Stanfield.
Herdee C. Butler, Tuxedo.
Maggie S. Cooley, Wagram.
Eva Walker, Walkertown.

PENNSYLVANIA

Emory C. Gardner, Hellam.

VERMONT

Harleigh A. Somers, Barnet.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who takest the wings of the morning, we would have Thy Spirit lead us to the ancient pastures of our fathers and bind us again with the ties of human relationships, dispensing the blessings of free government. Do Thou calm all differences and let our devotions be far from the din of the streets and from the tangled thoughts of the crowd. Hear us as we pray: "May the words of our mouth and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer."

O Father of matchless mercy, grant that every crown of prosperity may suggest a brother's cross, every hearthstone remind us of the homeless and those who live and die in solitary places. We pray for an honest, sincere consideration of the opinions of others. There is no quality which has more response than courtesy, the aroma of good conduct; he who sows it reaps love. As fervor and faith are the seeds of de-

mocracy, give us such earnestness to do the right that distressed humankind shall be free to stand amid the storms and blasts of time. O may we be servants among men, the nobler of the noble and the truer of the true. While our fair world is wrestling with the demons of darkness may we scorn their inglorious strife, and over the sea and over the tides of iniquitous war let us see Thy face and hold Thy hand. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of J. C. Davidson and Vassie Lee Davidson;
H. R. 3298. An act for the relief of Nels J. Pedersen; and
H. R. 3351. An act for the relief of Howard L. Pemberton.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 429. An act authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to William Mitchell;

S. 556. An act for the relief of Pedro Jose Arrecochea;

S. 616. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Vullo;

S. 662. An act to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes;

S. 698. An act to amend part II of Veterans Regulations No. 1 (a);

S. 866. An act to fix compensation of registers of the district land office in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended;

S. 891. An act for the relief of Rebecca Collins and W. W. Collins;

S. 1028. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia;

S. 1102. An act for the relief of Helene Murphy;

S. 1112. An act for the relief of Taylor W. Tonge;

S. 1227. An act to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for killing or assaulting the Federal officers;

S. 1232. An act to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior;

S. 1272. An act to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations;

S. 1323. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. Ross;

S. 1326. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Straka;

S. 1335. An act to amend the fourth and fifth provisos of section 2 of the act entitled "An Act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain", approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 438; 30 U. S. C., secs. 201, 202);

S. 1340. An act to provide for the grading of restaurants in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1387. An act to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into

a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River;

S. 1399. An act for the relief of Frank Knowles;

S. 1407. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Puerto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, as amended, and known as the Organic Act of Puerto Rico;

S. 1421. An act making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers, feeds, nursery stock, or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States;

S. 1428. An act to amend the provision of the act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men, or nurses of the Navy or Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1433. An act for the relief of Clarence A. Giddens;

S. 1484. An act for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes;

S. 1517. An act for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve;

S. 1539. An act to authorize the carrying of Civil War battle streamers with regimental colors;

S. 1542. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. O-3 at the United States naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943;

S. 1546. An act to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864;

S. 1549. An act for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield;

S. 1554. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942;

S. 1563. An act for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell;

S. 1579. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933;

S. 1589. An act for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash.;

S. 1632. An act for the relief of Capt. S. E. McCarty (Supply Corps), United States Navy;

S. 1635. An act to eliminate a pay discrimination against the teacher of music at the United States Military Academy;

S. 1640. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept gifts and bequests for the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes;

S. 1647. An act to amend the act approved March 2, 1895, as amended;

S. 1653. An act to provide titles for heads of staff departments of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1658. An act to extend for 1 year the date of termination of Public Law 22, dated April 1, 1943, entitled "To provide for a temporary increase in compensation for certain employees of the District of Columbia Government and the White House Police force";

S. 1668. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 1669. An act to clarify the law relative to allowances for mileage of graduates of the United States Military Academy and transportation of their dependents on assignment to their first duty station and to the mileage allowance of persons entering the United States Military Academy as cadets.

S. 1676. An act for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps.

S. 1677. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property